

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.  
N<sup>o</sup> CXXV. OCTOBER 1906.

---

ART. I.—THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.

1. *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.*
2. *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.* Four Vols. London, 1906.  
Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office by  
Wyman and Sons, Limited, Fetter Lane, E.C.

PERHAPS the most remarkable event in the ecclesiastical world for some time past is the issue of a unanimous Report by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. For that reason, for the eminence and high character of the members of the Commission, and for the judicial character of the Report, it demands from us the very fullest and most careful attention. We do not think that we shall be considered by our readers to be trespassing unduly on their patience and their time if we devote a considerable amount of space to the consideration of it.

A word may be said at the outset with regard to the Commission itself. We entirely disagree with the efforts which have been made from more than one quarter to discredit or discount the importance which attaches to its Report. Those who do so seem to us to live in a little world of their own, and to be ignorant of the dissatisfaction which

VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

B

exists among a large section of the laity and which is obscured rather than expressed by the noisy clamours that attract attention. There is a real danger of unwise and irritating legislation in consequence. But it will, we think, be admitted by anyone who has read the evidence with any care or attention that the Commission have carried out their duties very ably and impartially. They have listened with patience to every thing that has been said to them, and they have subjected every witness, whatever his views, who was worth it, and some perhaps who were not, to a most searching cross-examination. People who had not thought out their theories, or were quite convinced that there was nothing to be said against them, must have gone away, we imagine, with a good many misgivings, and have felt that it was not quite certain that they were right and their opponents wrong in all cases. But although the examination was strict and searching, it was obviously directed in all cases to finding out what was really the truth, and to seeing what way could be found out of the existing difficulties.

One particular point we must refer to. Some representatives of churches against which evidence was brought objected to the Commissioners for admitting reports from persons whom they describe as spies. They stated that there was no concealment about what they did, and that proper inquiries should have been made through the bishops. It is quite clear that there was in most cases no desire for concealment, and that the Commissioners could have obtained in that way a more accurate account of the ritual in the churches in question ; but such a course would not have met the needs of the case. The object of the Commission was to inquire into complaints which were made. A number of persons wished to be heard. They were men full of suspicions of what was going on. It was absolutely essential to any good effect of the inquiry that the fullest opportunity should be given them of stating exactly what they believed to be going on. Both the bishops and the clergy were, so to speak, on their trial, and to be satisfied with their evidence alone would have been most unjudicial. We are sorry, too, that one witness should have suggested, without



any grounds for the accusation, that the Commissioners were in any way prejudiced or not capable of estimating the value of what they heard.<sup>1</sup>

As to the witnesses, the less we say about some of them the better. But their evidence is important, not so much for the value or accuracy of their descriptions of services, as for the evidence which they give of their own mental attitude. They varied in character: some were more accurate and intelligent than others; but, throughout, their aim seems to be to make things out as bad as possible; they see evil where there is no evil; and they are very often extremely ignorant of the Church services. Two witnesses were guilty of much more than irreverence and unseemliness, and the letter written on that occasion by the Secretary of the Church Association is sufficient evidence that many at any rate of the accusers were far less loyal to the spirit of the Church of England than those whom they were so eager to attack.<sup>2</sup> We could have wished that some of the clergy had been more dignified in their replies. They would have been more effective had they shewn a little less indignation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Q. 12816-12820.    <sup>2</sup> Q. 14485-14490, 15466-15493, 15494-15499.

<sup>3</sup> We cannot help alluding more particularly to two witnesses whose position makes their ignorance and animus more conspicuous—Lady Wimborne and Lady Lindsey. In one case the former states: 'It was the Holy Communion service. In all these churches it begins with the Commandments; when it takes place at 10 o'clock they preach a short sermon, and then go on to the Communion proper' (Q. 3856). From this we should gather that Lady Wimborne does not realize that the Commandments in the Book of Common Prayer come at the beginning of the Communion Service, and is used to churches in which they are often omitted. Lady Lindsey's description of the services at St. Saviour's, Hitchin (as of other services) is ludicrously inaccurate, and we sympathize with Mr. Gainsford's complaint, when the evidence was sent to him for comment without the name of the witness: 'In conclusion, I may be allowed to add that, after upwards of fifty-two years in Holy Orders, spent to the best of my ability in the active work of the Church, serving "without reproach" under seven bishops (five of them in this diocese), I think the Commission will agree with me that it is a sad and undeserved ending to be asked to answer the statements of a nameless spy, many of which are untruthful, and all of which are the outcome of bitter feeling and narrow-mindedness.' (*Evidence*, vol. i. p. 262.)

## I.

Let us ask, first of all, what was the accusation with which the Commissioners had to deal. It was this: that owing to the prevalence of what is called 'Ritualism,' a complete change has been introduced into the services of the Church of England; that in particular the 'Roman Mass' has taken the place of the Communion service; that these changes are very widely prevalent; that they imply widespread disloyalty to the Church of England, and a desire to approximate to the Church of Rome; that they are illegal; that the bishops, so far from checking the law-breakers, have aided and abetted them, and that the laity of the nation are being widely alienated from the Church of England by these practices. These charges were formulated in their most complete form by Sir William Harcourt in certain well-known letters, which, together with incidents we need not further refer to, were largely the cause of this Commission. The Archbishop of Canterbury gives an extract from them in his evidence, which we may quote:

'In face of the fact that there existed a plain, simple and decisive remedy against offences by removing the offender, and disabling him from further misdoing, any man of ordinary common sense will ask: why has this cure for lawlessness in the Church been so long in abeyance? The answer is obvious. It is due to the deliberate and combined resolve of the bishops not to put the law in force, or to allow others, who equally possess the legal right, to assert it. The only thing with which this conduct could be compared would be that of the judges of the Realm if they were to enter into an agreement to stay every suit which might be brought into the courts, or if the Law Officers of the Crown were to enter a *nolle prosequi* on every indictment. In such case, civil society would be in just about the same condition as that to which the episcopate has reduced the Church. They have for years shut the gates of ecclesiastical justice; they have deprived the laity of the protection which the law had provided; they have guaranteed the clergy against any penalty for any and every offence against the law of the Church.'

<sup>1</sup> Q. 12960 (vol. ii. p. 370).

Now, as to the alleged acts there is no doubt. As to the character of the services in many churches there is no concealment and no denial. In every case in which evidence had been brought against an incumbent, he has been given an opportunity of contradicting it, either by letter or in person. He has generally written. He protests against the *animus* in the evidence, he often corrects inaccuracies, which are sometimes ludicrous, but that the general character of the services was such as was described, he neither denies nor wishes to deny. It may be convenient to quote the finding of the Commissioners :

‘ In a large number of the Services of Holy Communion as to which evidence has been given, vestments, the Confiteor, illegal lights, incense, the Lavabo, the ceremonial mixing of the chalice, the wafer, a posture rendering the manual acts invisible, the sacring bell and the Last Gospel, are all or nearly all in use, and unite to change the outward character of the service from that of the traditional service of the Reformed English Church to that of the traditional service of the Church of Rome.’<sup>1</sup>

We are dealing only with facts, and that the facts are as stated there can be no doubt. How far such services prevail it is more difficult to say. The Commissioners state the number of times in which each particular practice which has been reported to them occurs in the churches about which they have evidence, and the Secretary of the Church Association relies mainly on the ‘ Tourists’ Guide ’ for his opinion that ritualistic practices are widely prevalent. It is from time to time stated that in more than 2,000<sup>2</sup> churches, vestments—which are perhaps considered to be the decisive test—are used. All that we can say definitely is that churches in which a dignified ritual is found are numerous.

The facts being so, the important question then is their significance. In what sense are these services Romish ?

<sup>1</sup> Report, § 296, p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> The number is given at 2,000, 3,000, 4,000 and 5,000 in different places.

And do they imply disloyalty to the Church of England? Here we may quote the Commissioners again :

'The significance of many of [these irregularities] lies rather in an apparent approximation to the forms of worship of the Church of Rome than in any necessary or essential connexion with Roman doctrine.' . . . 'The *primâ facie* significance of this similarity is, however, strenuously repudiated by large numbers of loyal members of the Church of England, who, claiming quite truly that many of these things took their rise in ancient times, before the introduction of Roman abuses, see in their use a token of the continuity of the Church of Christ; and, further, relying on the absence of any harmful symbolism, honestly believe them to be in accordance with the teaching of the Prayer Book and the law of the Church of England as in their view it ought to be declared.'<sup>1</sup>

We are convinced that any fair-minded person reading through the evidence before us will be satisfied that the great bulk of the clergy who are what is called Ritualists, however self-willed and headstrong they may be, are not in any real sense of the word 'disloyal,' much less so than many of their accusers, some of whom attend regularly at Nonconformist places of worship. We might give many quotations in support of this statement, but we think that probably the following extract from a letter of the present Bishop of Durham will carry much weight :

'My personal persuasion meanwhile is that the problem of legislation upon vestments is as important and delicate well nigh as it can be, and that the most considerate care will be called for, lest, in the restrictive regulation which is most assuredly in some form called for, clergymen in considerable numbers should be alienated who are in spirit deeply loyal to the Prayer Book.'<sup>2</sup>

We can only echo these last words. The great body of those who are attacked in this Report (we leave out of consideration certain special cases) are thoroughly loyal both to the spirit of the Prayer Book and the spiritual claims of the English Church; while as to the relation of these practices to the Roman controversy we would refer to the

<sup>1</sup> Report, *ib.*

<sup>2</sup> Evidence, vol. iv. p. 17.

very remarkable declaration made by the Bishop of Bristol. He, as he states, is busied with the Roman controversy; he takes a somewhat alarmist view of the future, which may or may not be justified, and believes that a determined attack may be made upon England and the English Church, and he is convinced that with a view to that contingency any attempt to 'puritanize' the Church would be deplorable, and that the full ritual of the First Prayer Book, including incense, should be allowed.

'The nearer you get to the First Prayer Book the better, so long as it is perfectly clear that you do not require anyone to take a step further in the way of ritual than they are now accustomed to. I would not touch the Puritan side at all, but I would just legalise a number of things which are done by people who are as true and staunch supporters of the Church of England and of that side generally as against the Church of Rome as you have in the whole of the kingdom.'<sup>1</sup>

We do not think that it is necessary to collect further evidence on this point. But we would ask our readers, and especially those who sympathize most strongly with the Ritualistic movement, to consider somewhat sympathetically the other side. We admit that it is difficult, because there is a great deal in these volumes which represents Protestantism or Puritanism in its least pleasing aspect. But if they will read very carefully the evidence of Mr. J. Inskip,<sup>2</sup> they will see how natural this feeling of distrust and suspicion is to anyone who, with very opposite principles, finds himself confronted by the vigorous but reckless advance of the Ritualistic movement. He is bewildered. What end can there be but one? Every concession made is simply a starting point for a new advance. Grant the surplice, and vestments follow; grant the Eastward position, and incense is demanded. If vestments are 'legalized,' they will become almost universal, and a demand

<sup>1</sup> Q. 15229. It may be noted that there is clearly a widespread feeling among the Bishops that legislation to this effect is necessary. See, for example, the evidence of the Bishops of St. Albans and Birmingham.

<sup>2</sup> Qs. 14712-14876.

will be made, as in some colonial dioceses, for them to be made compulsory. Where will it all stop? The people who were once called advanced are now spoken of as moderate Ritualists. Is there any end possible, or, in fact, intended, except the assimilation of the whole Roman system? <sup>1</sup>

Such complaints are not unnatural. What has occurred is what always happens in the case of a religious movement. People start with principles which lead them further than they expect, and naturally a great deal of suspicion is created, and accusations of dishonesty are made. Many are reckless and inconsiderate. They rush on in their ignorance and accept a great deal which is not really defensible, and a spirit of loyalty leads others to defend them. All this is very natural; but it does a great deal of harm. It destroys confidence and breeds suspicion. It is injurious to the Church. And it is time now that all such ill-considered action should cease. The High Church party as a whole must recognize that the period of inception has come to an end; the time of rash experimentalization must cease; if they are to hold the ground they have won, if they are to advance further, they must make quite clear what their aims and intentions are. There must be no suspicion of mystery. There is no obligation of loyalty or honour to defend those of their members who will not be loyal to the Church. A great deal is due to the loyal 'Evangelical' members of the Church, many of whom have acted with great consideration, and to the great body of moderate Churchmen who form the strength of the Church, and whose sympathy on certain points has made the Ritualist movement possible.

<sup>1</sup> The following quotation from the *Church Times* (September 7, 1906) will illustrate this: 'Thus, in the diocese of Birmingham, at any rate, all the points of ceremonial that Churchmen of the past, while despairing of, strove for, and for the sake of which one of their priests was imprisoned and ruined in mind and body and estate, have now received publicly the seal of episcopal sanction. History thus repeats itself in regard to vestments, lights, incense, etc., as in former years the use of the surplice in the pulpit and surplined choirs denounced by one generation of Bishops were advocated by their successors.'

## II.

We believe that the Evidence and the Report clearly absolve those who are called Ritualists as a body from any charge of disloyalty. But at any rate it is alleged, these practices are illegal and the clergy who are guilty of them are 'lawbreakers.' On this point there can be no doubt: as the law is at present declared by the Courts, many of the practices complained of are illegal. Of this there can be no question, nor is the charge denied. But there are certain contentions on the other side. It is argued in the first place that, even if they are illegal, breaches of the law are made by all clergy, and that the plain directions of the Prayer Book are habitually disregarded by those who are most loud in their denunciations of the Ritualists, and that the very greatest unfairness has been shewn towards them, as if they were the only lawbreakers. The Churchwarden of St. Peter's, London Docks, puts very clearly what a large number of people undoubtedly feel:

'We do feel that if there is going to be any levelling down, there should be some levelling up, and that it is rather hard upon us to try and be loyal, as we do, and give up services which the bishop will not allow, when we look round and find that others do pretty well what they like.'<sup>1</sup>

Now there can be no doubt that there is a great deal to justify this plea. The Act of Uniformity has never been obeyed.

'While a large comprehensiveness in matters of doctrine has grown up, the rigidity of the law as to the rites and ceremonies of the "open prayer" which is for all "to come unto" has been maintained. The result has been a widespread disobedience to the letter of the law, which, though acquiesced in, in quiet times, has made the enforcement of uniformity, when startling innovations rendered appeal to the law inevitable, difficult and invidious. It has proved impracticable to obtain complete obedience to the Acts of Uniformity in one particular direction, partly because it is not now, and never has been, demanded in other directions.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Q. 13695.

<sup>2</sup> Report, § 355.



Again :

‘The law relating to the conduct of Divine service and the ornaments of churches is, in our belief, nowhere exactly observed ; and certain minor breaches of it are very generally prevalent.’<sup>1</sup>

and as regards omissions the Commissioners write :

‘We do not think that in many cases there is a deliberate intention to disregard what the Prayer Book requires. But the aggregate effect of a number of omissions goes far beyond the significance which any of them separately would have. In parishes—and not a few such may still be found—where there is no daily service, no proper observance of Holy-days, no notice of Ember Days, no public catechising on Sundays, and perhaps no service even on Ascension Day, it cannot be denied that the standard of worship and of religious observance set before the parishioners differs widely from that which the Prayer Book enjoins.’<sup>2</sup>

We do not for a moment say that because another person does wrong it excuses us for doing it, or that two blacks make a white, but the Commissioners’ definite recognition of the fact that the Ritualists are not the only law-breakers ought to do something to remove the very natural feeling of injustice which has prevailed.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, it has been maintained that the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical cases—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—is not a proper court for trying ecclesiastical cases, and that its judgements vitiate those of the courts below which are bound by its decisions. While it usurps the functions of an Ecclesiastical Court, it violates all the constitutional principles on which the Reformation settlement was carried out. The question of the Ecclesiastical Courts was gone into at considerable length, and the evidence of Sir Lewis Dibdin is of the greatest value and should be carefully read. He makes it quite plain that

<sup>1</sup> Report, § 292.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* § 295.

<sup>3</sup> For a very amusing instance of the methods of the Commission we recommend our readers to study the cross-examination of the Dean of Norwich, who had been very loud in his complaint of illegality, and whose own acts of illegality were very clearly brought home to him (Q. 13702–13813).

the distinction between a Spiritual and a State Court is clearly recognized by our Constitution. The latter has not spiritual jurisdiction, the former derives its coercive jurisdiction from the Crown. There is therefore an appeal to the Crown for lack of justice. The final court of appeal has no authority, therefore, as a Spiritual Court, and in spiritual matters it should not attempt to lay down what is the law of the Church.

The following extracts from his evidence are of interest :

'The difference between a Spiritual Court, which I rather prefer as an expression to an Ecclesiastical Court, because it makes more clear what I mean—the difference between a Spiritual Court and a State Court is that the former has spiritual jurisdiction and the latter has not. Now that term "spiritual jurisdiction" of course is a technical term and I want to read two extracts, one from Bishop Stillingfleet to represent the Church view, and the other from Sir Matthew Hale to represent the view of the lawyer on the point. The extract from Bishop Stillingfleet is contained in his work called "Ecclesiastical Cases," in the second volume at page 50.

'Can you give the date?—Stillingfleet lived from 1635 to 1699. This book was published in 1689. This is the extract: "In the ordinary jurisdiction of bishops, there are two things especially to be distinguished. I. The original right belonging to their office, which they have from Christ, the Founder and Head of the Church, the Fountain of Spiritual Jurisdiction. II. The authority to execute such a jurisdiction within the realm, and the rules and measures of exercising it—which are prescribed by the laws of the land—to transgress the bounds so prescribed is an offence against the Crown and Royal Dignity." So far as possible unless it is necessary I do not want to say anything beyond the reading of extracts. I think that is clear. Then as to Chief Justice Hale (1609-1676); I am reading from his tract on the Royal Supremacy which exists as part of a larger work in Lincoln's Inn Library, which has never been published, but this particular chapter was printed by myself twenty years ago for private circulation. The passage is at page 10 of the tract. This chapter is headed "Original of Ecclesiastical Power." He divides the chapter into sections A, B, C, D. I omit A and B, which have to do with the power of order, *i.e.* of conferring Holy Orders. Then he continues—"C. The power of the Keys, *in foro conscientia*,

which is not properly a jurisdiction because it is without any external coercion or change in the party. This is not derived from the Crown, but from a higher commission. D. All power of external jurisdiction is originally in the King, either formally to exercise, or at least virtually to derive, which is evident. We do suppose for the present that, before Christianity here admitted, the *summa potestas* was in the King, when Christianity was first introduced" (I think he means introduced into England). "I conceive it came not in without some form of external ecclesiastical discipline or coercion, though at the first it entered into the world without it. But that external discipline could not bind any man to the submission to it, but either by the immediate power regal (where the King received it) or by the submission voluntary of those that did receive it. If the former, then it was the civil power of this kingdom that gave that form of ecclesiastical jurisdiction its life. If the latter, it was but a voluntary pact or submission, which could not give it power longer than the party submitting pleased, and than the King allowed, connived at, or did not prohibit, and this by degrees introduced a custom whereby it became equal to other customs or civil usages."'<sup>1</sup>

Further extracts make it clear that while there must be an appeal to the Crown from the Church courts, it is not meant that 'Kings and Queens in their own proper persons are by judicial sentence to decide the questions which rise about matters of faith and Christian religion'—a proposition which Hooker describes as 'absurd.' Extracts are also given from the preamble of an Act of Henry VIII. which states that the King, 'if any cause of the law divine or of spiritual learning happen to come in question, is to have it declared, interpreted, and showed by the spirituality, or English Church;' and Coke states that 'in causes ecclesiastical . . . the same are to be determined and decided by ecclesiastical judges according to the King's ecclesiastical laws of this realm.'<sup>2</sup>

These extracts make it clear that, in so far as the Judicial Committee has taken upon itself the functions of an

<sup>1</sup> Q. 23535-23536.

<sup>2</sup> See Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* VIII. viii. 1; Coke's *Reports*, 28a, 28b, quoted in full by Sir Lewis Dibdin in the Evidence, and by the Commissioners in their Report, § 356, p. 65.

ecclesiastical court and has attempted to declare the law of the Church in spiritual things, it has clearly usurped a position which does not belong to it constitutionally. The main contention, therefore, of those who are dissatisfied with it is substantiated.

The Commissioners' conclusion on this part is as follows :

'We observe that there has been some divergence between the course to which these principles would lead and the course which has in fact been taken, and that this divergence has grown more conspicuous in recent times.'<sup>1</sup>

These are cautious words, as befits the body which uses them, but they are of very great significance. The Commissioners further lay great stress on the necessity of any court which has to secure the obedience of the clergy obtaining moral support :

'A Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognise the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot practically be enforced.'<sup>2</sup>

A third main contention is that as a matter of fact it is the Ritualists who do obey the law, and that the law has been misinterpreted against them, and this intentionally. Such a contention would have little weight if the courts had been satisfactory, because no one has any right to interpret the law privately. The question of the Ornaments rubric is gone into by the Commissioners at great length, although they do not express an opinion on the legal point, but a careful study of the evidence will suggest that, whether the interpretation at present given by the Judicial Committee be right or wrong, it is quite impossible to say that it is sufficiently certain to form adequate authority for regulating the worship of the Church of England. We think that the evidence brought forward makes it quite clear that the Ornaments rubric refers to the First Prayer Book, and that there is no justification for the interpretation

<sup>1</sup> Report, § 359.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, § 363.

which has been recently urged, that it refers to the conditions prevailing before the Second Prayer Book was introduced. But as to the further question whether 'other order has been taken,' we feel it very difficult to believe that the decisions of the Courts are correct. The whole subject was gone into with very great thoroughness. By far the ablest evidence was that given by the Rev. W. H. Frere, who stood his somewhat severe cross-examination with marked ability. Our own opinion is that the Advertisements had no royal authority, and that the Queen deliberately refused to give it to them; that they were not intended to abrogate the Ornaments rubric, but to secure at any rate the wearing of the surplice; that when the Ornaments rubric was re-enacted in 1662, it was not intended that the Advertisements should be read into it, and that the meaning assigned to it by the High Church party was that almost universally held by liturgical authorities until it was thought necessary to find some way of getting round it. The ultimate argument used is not one which would ever bind the conscience of an intelligent person, although it might satisfy a lawyer. This is how the legal position is summed up:

'As I understand Lord Selborne, the point is that, whatever the authority to start with, they were afterwards treated as law for so long that everything must be presumed in their favour.' We can only echo Mr. Frere's answer to this. 'Then the legal opinion would be that there need be no definite authority.'<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that law interpreted in that way, will not bind anyone's conscience nor serve any useful purpose; and this the Commissioners recognize by pointing out the necessity for a new rubric.

But unfortunately this is not the whole account of the matter. It is the lamentable result of any disobedience to law, even if it be justifiable, that it creates a habit of lawlessness, and this has unfortunately been the case in the Church of England. We may quote the evidence of Mr. Athelstan Riley on this subject, as he cannot in this

<sup>1</sup> Q. 2447.

connexion be considered either an ignorant or a prejudiced witness :

‘ But I do think that the lawlessness, the disregard for law on the part of all orders in the Church, has increased of late years, and it has increased, I think, for this reason, on account of what I may call the ruin which has befallen the ecclesiastical courts.’<sup>1</sup>

‘ I think there is a general sort of disposition amongst the clergy to say, “ Oh ! we may as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb ; we really do not know what the law is ; the whole thing is in confusion ; we will do what we like.” I think that is the spirit that is abroad, and I think it is abroad more or less among all parties and all ranks.’<sup>2</sup>

Now there is no doubt that there is a good deal of truth in this. And it is not a healthy sign. We are glad to think that there is considerable evidence of a great improvement in recent years. The definite directions of bishops have very largely been obeyed. Thus, for example, the Churchwarden of St. Peter’s, London Docks, says :

‘ Has everything that the bishop objects to in the correspondence which you read to us been stopped at the church ?— Absolutely. Father Wainwright is most particular.’<sup>3</sup>

The Lambeth decisions on incense and reservation, or rather the directions of the bishops based on those decisions, although they were founded on principles which were displeasing to a large number of the persons interested, have very largely been obeyed. The result of public discussion has had a tendency to make people see that some sort of law is necessary.

But there is still a certain attitude of mind and there are certain declarations of leading men which have created the impression that the Ritualists have made up their mind to get what they want, and will always find a reason for not obeying any authority which they dislike. They will obey the bishops, it is said ; but we now find that this is qualified in various ways. Clearly if the opinion of the bishop happens to agree with a ruling of the Privy Council, he is only expressing the ruling of a secular court, and conscience forbids

<sup>1</sup> Q. 1083.

<sup>2</sup> Q. 1085.

<sup>3</sup> Q. 13659.

that he should be obeyed. He can only order what is canonical, and he cannot give any order which is contrary to the rule of the Catholic Church; and if it be asked who is to decide what is contrary to the Catholic Church, we find that it is the individual conscience. If we agree that the present court of final appeal is unsatisfactory, and ask what court would be satisfactory, we find it very hard to get an answer. One witness says there must be an appeal to the whole episcopate of the Anglican Church. Another seems to think that no secular court at all must be allowed. An unsympathetic critic of the evidence might be inclined to say that the only court that will be acquiesced in and the only authority obeyed will be one which gives the decisions of which the witnesses approve, and that they refuse to commit themselves that they may still have an excuse for disobeying.

Now we do not say that this is the real attitude, but we do feel very strongly that much that is done gives this impression, and it is an impression which might be most injurious. Because we have gone on for a time with this spirit of lawlessness which Mr. Athelstan Riley has described, because it may even have been beneficial when a great body of new ideas were coming in, that does not mean that it is healthy. It will speedily become very unhealthy; in fact many people feel that it has done so already. The time has come when the High Church party must make up their minds what authority they will obey even when it makes decisions with which they do not agree. The Church as a whole must recognize that there is need not for uniformity but for order. Until we are an orderly Church we shall not be able adequately to fulfil the great mission with which we are entrusted, and the Church of England will not be able to enter fully into the great heritage which is reserved for it.

A general accusation has been made against the bishops that they have aided and abetted these practices, that they have refused to administer the law, and have used their veto to stop prosecutions: not only have the clergy acted illegally, but the bishops have aided and abetted them. We advise



anyone who thinks that this is the case to read carefully the evidence of the bishops who have appeared before the Commission, and, we think, that it will become apparent, that they have done their best, as administrators of a law which had ceased to have any hold on men's consciences. As to the question of the veto, any charge dealing with that is completely disposed of by the archbishop's evidence. He shews conclusively that prosecutions ceased not because of the veto, which has very rarely been exercised by any bishop, but because it was felt that prosecutions were not likely to have the effect desired. Here is an extract from the *Record* of 1884:

'We believe that ecclesiastical litigation, whether against bishops or clergy, is at the present time not only undesirable but extremely likely to do mischief to the cause of Protestant evangelical truth in the Church of England. What we do say is, that though the time for litigation may come the present is not such a time. We can hardly imagine any course more certain to prejudice public opinion against the party who pursue it, more inevitably doomed to failure, so far as practical result is concerned, or more directly calculated to deaden spiritual vitality and promote a harsh unchristian spirit.'<sup>1</sup>

If we turn to the action of the bishops, it becomes apparent that they have had an extremely difficult position. They have been hampered very much by the attempt which has been made to create a sort of mob-law. They have had to decide for themselves what law they should administer. They have had to remember that the first thing that concerns them is the spiritual good of the people committed to their charge. They have felt that it is not their duty to put before some of their most hardworking and devoted clergymen the alternative of submission or the Church of Rome. They have felt that in some particular cases special consideration must be given. It was not possible to demand suddenly a change in customs which had been acquiesced in for many years, and to which large congregations had become accustomed. There is another criticism of a more general kind which we have to make to the action

<sup>1</sup> Evidence, Q. 12961.

of the bishops; but, speaking generally, it becomes apparent that they have administered their dioceses in a broad and statesmanlike way. They have been fair and patient, and have been met as bishops in almost all cases with respect and obedience. The number of churches which are actually disobedient, some of which are ritualistic and some evangelical, are very few in number. The Commissioners think that in some instances greater firmness might have been shewn, and they point out the inconvenience which arises from the present state of the law. They sum up generally as follows:

'These instances—many others might be given—are illustrations of the inconsistency into which administrators, even men so distinguished and respected as those we have mentioned, are driven, who, encountering breaches of the law, are, in the lack of regulative authority, compelled by the force of circumstances to meet the difficulty by compromises of their own. It may be that greater firmness and a clearer appreciation of definite lines both of policy and of principle might have led to better results. But, in our view, the real remedy is (1) the substitution of a carefully defined elasticity for one fixed standard of rites and ceremonies; (2) a power vested in the Bishops, as a body, of authorising special services and prayers and of regulating the use of hymns and anthems; (3) reservation to the office of the individual Bishop of a due power of control within the limits thus determined.'<sup>1</sup>

### III.

We now come last of all to the gravest of the accusations made against the Ritualistic clergy, that they have alienated the laity from the Church. If an average High Churchman were asked whether this was true, he would say: On the contrary we have done more to strengthen the hold of the Church upon the people than any other body of men. Which of these two contentions is right? The following is the result of the evidence, as we have been able to sum it up.

(1) That a large number of the Ritualistic churches have some of the strongest and most enthusiastic congrega-

<sup>1</sup> Report, § 391.

tions both in London and also in the country. This is true both in rich and poor neighbourhoods.

(2) That, on the other hand, there are many places where the introduction of Ritualistic practices appears to have largely emptied the church. What are we to say, for example, to the service at Shirebrook, Derbyshire? The population of the parish is 8,798. On Sunday, January 1, 1905, there were present 'twelve men and eleven women only, and about forty children at the Morning Service.'

'The result of these practices has prevented my family, myself, and household, though members of the Church of England and living in the parish, from attending the services; and other parishioners have also been driven from the church. The population of the parish is 8,798. On Christmas Day at the 11 a.m. Communion Service there were only four men present, including myself, a few women and little children. The children, owing to the long service, were laughing and playing most of the time. Very often at the Morning Service there is not a single man present except the officials of the church, while there are large congregations at all the Nonconformist places of worship. Parishioners who have been driven from the church are not able to attend any other church without driving, as there is no other Church of England church within reasonable walking distance.'

<sup>1</sup>

There is no contradiction of these statements. The witness was a member of Parliament and a resident in the parish.

Take, again, the case of St. John's, Spalding. The population of the parish is 2,112. 'The eleven o'clock service was attended by a congregation consisting of twenty-five boys and girls, of ages varying between four and eleven, presided over by a lady (the only communicant), six men, and three women.'

<sup>2</sup>

In reading through the evidence which is given, it becomes clear that there are many places in which the clergyman has acted in a very high-handed and inconsiderate way, and has offended many people who were regular attendants at the church; while the language which

<sup>1</sup> Evidence, Q. 11514.

<sup>2</sup> Q. 7593, 7599.

is used in replying to the Commissioners suggests that the method of dealing with those that are offended must have been the reverse of conciliatory.

But (3) it is occasionally true that people have been driven from church by changes in the opposite direction. Take the evidence of Dr. Cobb about his own action at St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate Street :

'What was the result of the change in the ceremonial in 1898 ?—The result of the change was the dispersal of the whole of the old congregation.'

'You state I see in the *précis* of your evidence (I am not quite sure whether you repeated it verbally) that as the result of the change at St. Ethelburga's, the former congregation scattered, some to Roman Catholic churches and the rest to other advanced churches. Can you tell us whether many went to Rome as the result of the change ?—Of course, the total congregation was never a very large number ; it is a small church. Out of a couple of hundred, I should think perhaps within the first two or three years from twelve to fifteen it may be went to Rome.'

Again, in the Bishop of Bristol's evidence :

'There is one since which I should like to mention to you, that is St. Raphael's, Bristol, because it is a very interesting case. The Vicar of St. Raphael's at once gave up the whole thing when my notice went out. It is an eclectic congregation, and the church depends for its maintenance upon the congregation. He found that practically the congregation was dwindling away. He resigned. His successor came ; he was quite loyal, and after a time he came to me and said, "Is there any reason why I should see my congregation disappearing when if I were doing what those who have obeyed your requisition are doing, namely, using incense up to a certain point, I should keep my congregation ?" It was a very difficult question for me. I felt that of all things I must be just, and considering that his had been one of the incense churches, I could not say to him "You must not do what other churches who are obeying my requisition as far as I understand are doing." He was not the incumbent who had given it up, and he began a modified use, and, so far as the congregation is concerned, that saved the

<sup>1</sup> Q. 11335.

<sup>2</sup> Q. 11417.

position. My action, I am perfectly aware, is open to question, but I tried to settle it on the ground of justice.'<sup>1</sup>

What is quite clear is that any sudden, violent, or inconsiderate change will break up a congregation and alienate the laity. The older Ritualistic congregations were built up by clergy who often advanced themselves gradually, and taught their congregation as they went on. But when a new clergyman suddenly sweeps away old things, and changes the service to which his parishioners have become accustomed, in whatever direction it be, he is certain to alienate some members of the congregation. On the other hand, there are many instances recorded in these volumes of clergy who have adopted vestments at the request of their people. Yet we are inclined to think that the Commissioners are right in suggesting that the great bulk of the people of this country do not really care for a very ornate service.

'Apart altogether from the question of connexion with the Church of Rome, it may well be doubted how far elaborate spectacular ceremonial of this kind can be consistent with the spirit and genius of the Church of England. The amount of symbolism which may with advantage accompany worship depends partly on national character and individual temperament, but also partly on the circumstances of each age.'<sup>2</sup>

We believe that it will ultimately be found that both in the matter of music and of ritual, a more sober and less elaborate form of worship will prevail, and all the more if it is recognized that most of the practices referred to are not in themselves in any way objectionable, and that they may quite well be licensed for special churches and special occasions. A great deal depends upon the occasion and the place. What is fitting at a coronation seems irreverent and ridiculous in a village church.

#### IV.

We have now put before our readers very inadequately, but as fully as space permits, the results of the inquiry and

<sup>1</sup> Q. 15123.

<sup>2</sup> Report, § 296.

the facts. The real question is not the facts, which have never been denied, but what view we are to take of Ritualism in the Church of England. The ultimate question is the fundamental one—what is the character of the Church of England?—and some of the most interesting evidence which was given was that of those witnesses who were examined not on the particular points at issue but on the genius of the English Church. If we were to hold, as some apparently do, that the essence of the English Church is Protestant, that it is just like one of the Churches of the Continent, that at the Reformation a new Church was created, that its Christianity should be all of one type—and these are obviously the opinions of the representatives, for example, of the Church Association—then we should certainly consider as they do the condition of the Church at the present time most disastrous. There is not the slightest doubt in that case that more than half the clergy, and a very considerable portion of the laity, are flagrantly disloyal. But that that is not the true mind of the Church is brought out very clearly by two witnesses whose evidence is well worth reading, Dr. Sanday and the Dean of Canterbury. They are two very different types of mind. Dr. Sanday always tries to look for points of agreement, even at the expense of consistency; the Dean of Canterbury is always ready for a fight. Dr. Sanday is a better scholar than witness, and the Dean of Canterbury is an excellent one. But both are learned and honest men, and we certainly have a great admiration for the boldness and honesty with which the Dean of Canterbury gave his evidence. We do not quite agree with him: we think that he would draw the line too closely and rigorously at the point to which he is prepared to go, and that his appeal to six centuries is too artificial to have a real force; but the point is that both alike recognize the catholicity and comprehensiveness of the Church.

The position of the Church, then, is that its appeal is not to the principles of the Reformation but to the principles of the Catholic Church, and in particular, but not exclusively, to the Primitive Church. As a result of that appeal it protests against mediæval and Roman corruptions, and

in that sense it is 'Protestant.' But Protestantism is an accident not a principle, a negative not a constructive characteristic. It is an element in its character which might cease at any time, which everyone would profoundly hope might cease when the occasion for it passed away. We cannot, and do not therefore, base our characteristics on being a Protestant Church, but on being a Catholic Church. From this point of view the position is not serious, but it does not cease to be difficult.

The position is this. In the first place the Church has been, for the last seventy years, profoundly influenced by a movement which has asserted in a very vigorous manner the fundamental principles on which the Church has been built up. The results of that movement, which in its strong opposition to many modern tendencies of thought has been one of the most remarkable in recent religious history, have been felt not only in the English Church but among all religious bodies of the English-speaking world. It has transformed the services of the Church, profoundly changed its mode of thought, and inspired a new life in many different directions. Its work, direct or indirect, is probably by no means yet finished, although its creative force is not so dominant as it was. Naturally in a movement of much life and force there has been much wrong-headedness and extravagance, and perhaps some disloyalty. The extravagance has been increased by a good deal of injudicious and unfair handling, and by violent and wrongheaded popular opposition.

But this is only one side of the difficulty. There has been a profound change during the last hundred years in the thoughts and aspirations of the people, and whatever may be the respect that is felt for the Prayer Book, it is not possible to confine Christian worship at the present day within limits which may have satisfied the religious aspirations of the Elizabethan age. This is felt as much by Low Churchmen as by High Churchmen. Bishop Creighton said that the greatest disasters in the Church were caused by a desire for Uniformity; the Bishop of Liverpool pleads for very much greater freedom in Church services :



'I think, speaking as one who represents a large working class diocese, that we want more elasticity in our services. Whether we ought to have those services in consecrated buildings is a question; but I am quite sure that we want more of the mission hall type of service to appeal to the vast number who go nowhere and who cannot understand our Prayer Book. It seems to me to be a pity, if there is a big church in a parish and no mission hall of any kind, that such an informal service cannot be held in the church.'<sup>1</sup>

During the South African war, when the feelings of the nation were profoundly stirred, services were issued by authority which would have been condemned in less troubled times. Clearly we want greater freedom, and greater freedom can at present only be gained by breaking the law, and if the law may be broken in one direction, how can one assert it in another?

But, again, this is not all. No society can exist in a healthy condition for long in which the legislative and judicial arrangements are unsatisfactory. Practically the legislative power of the Church has been in abeyance since the Reformation. So far as the spiritual side of Church life goes, we cannot make the changes necessary for adapting the forms of the Church to the present day. Nor are the judicial forms in any better case. The evidence that we have quoted makes it clear that in the present ecclesiastical courts the constitutional forms are not observed. The power of governing the Church lies in the hands of the bishops, but the bishops cannot act ultimately unless there are courts which can enforce or correct their sentences. There is a further point on which sufficient stress has not been laid in the Report, although it has come out in the Evidence. The parishioners have not proper constitutional means for letting their views be felt in matters which concern them.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Q. 22059.

<sup>2</sup> We are somewhat surprised that the Commissioners should not have said anything about Parochial Church Councils, which were pressed upon them from various points of view. That one of the great evils is the possibility of the clergy trampling on the feelings of their congregations is quite clear. See, for example, the evidence of the Dean of Norwich (Q. 13776): 'My idea in this rough sketch that I have

Again another set of circumstances have arisen which modify the point of view of many persons—desire for Christian Reunion. The ideal of one Universal Church has made a profound impression on the minds of many people, and they have felt that everything that is possible must be done to overcome obstacles. They have desired to bring the customs and usages of the English Church into harmony with the other historic Churches of Christendom, and, with this object in view, have been willing to concede points on which they might better have remained firm, and to introduce changes which are of doubtful advantage. It may readily be admitted that their zeal has been indiscreet, and demands wise restraint, but no thoughtful person will too readily condemn them.

The position, then, which the Evidence given before the made of a remedial course is that I think the establishment by Parliament of parochial councils with legal powers would be most helpful to securing order, peace, unity, and an enormous accession of lay strength to the Church of England. I feel at the present time . . . that very largely we clergy have seriously strained the forbearance of the laity of England. . . . I think the laity should be protected against the capriciousness which marks many of the incumbents in our Church. The only way known to me in which that can be done (apart from love—mutual love—which would settle everything) would be by giving laymen, communicants, but elected on a wider basis, a right to say, "We shall not have our service altered. We shall not have our Sacraments changed or dropped."

So again Lord Hugh Cecil says (Q. 10421) : "The incumbent's position has become unwholesomely independent both of the bishop and of the congregation. He has grown not so much in right of his character as a priest, but rather in that of a freeholder, in that of the "parson of the parish," to be improperly indifferent to the admonitions of his superiors and the complaints of his flock. This evil, which by analogy with priestcraft may conveniently be called rectorcraft, is found in very various degrees and in all schools of thought in the Church ; and amongst other bad effects it greatly increases the friction which the religious movement causes by producing a harshness and tactlessness of method in making changes, thus arousing a degree of irritation and fear often quite disproportionate to the importance of the changes themselves." He makes a similar proposal to that of the Dean of Norwich (Q. 10510).

As an illustration of the advantages of a Parochial Council we may point to the evidence of Mr. F. C. Holiday, churchwarden of St. Augustine's, Kilburn (Q. 14060).

'I think, speaking as one who represents a large working class diocese, that we want more elasticity in our services. Whether we ought to have those services in consecrated buildings is a question; but I am quite sure that we want more of the mission hall type of service to appeal to the vast number who go nowhere and who cannot understand our Prayer Book. It seems to me to be a pity, if there is a big church in a parish and no mission hall of any kind, that such an informal service cannot be held in the church.'<sup>1</sup>

During the South African war, when the feelings of the nation were profoundly stirred, services were issued by authority which would have been condemned in less troubled times. Clearly we want greater freedom, and greater freedom can at present only be gained by breaking the law, and if the law may be broken in one direction, how can one assert it in another?

But, again, this is not all. No society can exist in a healthy condition for long in which the legislative and judicial arrangements are unsatisfactory. Practically the legislative power of the Church has been in abeyance since the Reformation. So far as the spiritual side of Church life goes, we cannot make the changes necessary for adapting the forms of the Church to the present day. Nor are the judicial forms in any better case. The evidence that we have quoted makes it clear that in the present ecclesiastical courts the constitutional forms are not observed. The power of governing the Church lies in the hands of the bishops, but the bishops cannot act ultimately unless there are courts which can enforce or correct their sentences. There is a further point on which sufficient stress has not been laid in the Report, although it has come out in the Evidence. The parishioners have not proper constitutional means for letting their views be felt in matters which concern them.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Q. 22059.

<sup>2</sup> We are somewhat surprised that the Commissioners should not have said anything about Parochial Church Councils, which were pressed upon them from various points of view. That one of the great evils is the possibility of the clergy trampling on the feelings of their congregations is quite clear. See, for example, the evidence of the Dean of Norwich (Q. 13776): 'My idea in this rough sketch that I have

Again another set of circumstances have arisen which modify the point of view of many persons—desire for Christian Reunion. The ideal of one Universal Church has made a profound impression on the minds of many people, and they have felt that everything that is possible must be done to overcome obstacles. They have desired to bring the customs and usages of the English Church into harmony with the other historic Churches of Christendom, and, with this object in view, have been willing to concede points on which they might better have remained firm, and to introduce changes which are of doubtful advantage. It may readily be admitted that their zeal has been indiscreet, and demands wise restraint, but no thoughtful person will too readily condemn them.

The position, then, which the Evidence given before the made of a remedial course is that I think the establishment by Parliament of parochial councils with legal powers would be most helpful to securing order, peace, unity, and an enormous accession of lay strength to the Church of England. I feel at the present time . . . that very largely we clergy have seriously strained the forbearance of the laity of England. . . . I think the laity should be protected against the capriciousness which marks many of the incumbents in our Church. The only way known to me in which that can be done (apart from love—mutual love—which would settle everything) would be by giving laymen, communicants, but elected on a wider basis, a right to say, "We shall not have our service altered. We shall not have our Sacraments changed or dropped."

So again Lord Hugh Cecil says (Q. 10421) : 'The incumbent's position has become unwholesomely independent both of the bishop and of the congregation. He has grown not so much in right of his character as a priest, but rather in that of a freeholder, in that of the "parson of the parish," to be improperly indifferent to the admonitions of his superiors and the complaints of his flock. This evil, which by analogy with priestcraft may conveniently be called rectorcraft, is found in very various degrees and in all schools of thought in the Church ; and amongst other bad effects it greatly increases the friction which the religious movement causes by producing a harshness and tactlessness of method in making changes, thus arousing a degree of irritation and fear often quite disproportionate to the importance of the changes themselves.' He makes a similar proposal to that of the Dean of Norwich (Q. 10510).

As an illustration of the advantages of a Parochial Council we may point to the evidence of Mr. F. C. Holiday, churchwarden of St. Augustine's, Kilburn (Q. 14060).

Commission reveals is a very complex one, not (as some people seem to think) simple. The Church is not suffering from decay but from abundance and vigour of life. The clergy are not disloyal, but the work of the Church has outgrown its constitutional forms. Clearly what is required is not the rigorous enforcement of the law but constructive statesmanship. How are we to meet the situation?

One thing the Report entirely, if only implicitly, condemns, and that is the legislation which has always been demanded by the extreme Protestant party. There is no doubt what they desire. Parliament is to declare that every High Church practice is illegal; then a court of summary jurisdiction, a sort of Star Chamber, is to be appointed which will automatically carry out the law. Everyone who refuses to conform will be turned out of his living. The result would be that the whole of the moderate High Church party would be thrown into sympathy with the alleged law-breakers. It would be somewhat drastic to turn out 4,000 clergy for wearing vestments. The difficulties of the situation will be increased by the fact that at least 4,000 more would immediately adopt them. The result might be to wreck the Church of England: it would certainly not reduce the practices complained of, nor the public opinion in support of them. We have sometimes wondered whether there would have been any Ritualism in England if it had not been for the virulent opposition which attacked it in its beginnings; but in any case we are quite assured that if Mr. Bowen's Bill were passed, it would mean the final triumph of the cause to which he is opposed.

## V.

It is now time for us to pass to the recommendations made by the Commission. We would say at once that we are in substantial agreement with the proposals that are made. Only on one point do we think that their advice is unhappily expressed and of doubtful wisdom. On most other points their advice is an important and convinc-

ing recognition of the chief measures which are necessary for the constitutional reform of the Church of England; and although we cannot help feeling doubtful as to whether Parliament will be prevailed upon to make the desired change, this public recognition of what is required is of the very greatest importance. We propose to divide what we have to say under four headings,

1. Immediate action for dealing with graver offences.
2. The suggested action of bishops and the legislative changes necessary to make it regular and effective.
3. Reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts.
4. Proposed legislation by Convocation.

1. The Commissioners have singled out certain practices which they condemn as being graver in character and of a kind that demand immediate suppression. These are all of very rare occurrence, and we have not considered them in our general view of the situation. The following is the language of the Report :

‘ There can, in our opinion, be no doubt of the wisdom of reserving the employment of legal coercion for grave cases which do not yield to milder measures. We think, however, that occasions have arisen more often than has been realised by the Bishops when the interests of the Church and her due administration demanded that discipline should be enforced by action in the Ecclesiastical Courts. The deliberate persistence in spite of a Bishop’s monition in practices significant of teaching repudiated by the Church of England ought to be met by an attempt at least to assert in a constitutional way the Church’s claim to obedience. If such attempts failed, the case for re-organisation of the Ecclesiastical Courts would be strengthened. But the fact that reforms are needed is not an adequate reason for allowing defiant lawlessness to go unchecked pending their adoption. Among the practices which we have already distinguished as being of special gravity and significance will be found the following :—

‘ The interpolation of the prayers and ceremonies belonging to the Canon of the Mass.

‘ The use of the words “ Behold the Lamb of God,” accompanied by the exhibition of a consecrated wafer or bread.



'Reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration.

'Mass of the Præ-sanctified.

'Corpus Christi processions with the Sacrament.

'Benediction with the Sacrament.

'Celebration of the Holy Eucharist with the intent that there shall be no communicant except the celebrant.

'Hymns, prayers, and devotions involving invocation of or confession to the Blessed Virgin Mary or the Saints.

'The observance of the festivals of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the Sacred Heart.

'The veneration of images and roods.

'These practices have an exceptional character as being marked by all the three following characteristics :—(1) they are clearly inconsistent with and subversive of the teaching of the Church of England as declared by the Articles and set forth in the Prayer Book ; (2) they are illegal ; and (3) their illegality cannot with any reason be held to depend upon judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or be affected by any view taken of the constitutional character of that tribunal. Any observance of All Souls' Day or of the festival of Corpus Christi which inculcates or implies "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory" or transubstantiation falls under the same censure. The arguments, based upon history and the usage of the Church before the Reformation, which have been urged before us upon many of the matters to which we have directed our attention, are, in the case of the practices to which we now refer, irrelevant. We desire to express our opinion that these practices should receive no toleration ; and that, if Episcopal directions for their prevention or repression are not complied with, the Bishops should take or permit coercive disciplinary action in the Church Courts for that purpose. Further, in the case of these practices, it is, in our opinion, unnecessary and undesirable to postpone proceedings until the reforms which we have recommended in connexion with the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes and the Diocesan and Provincial Courts can be carried into effect' (§§ 397-8).

Now with the general condemnation of these practices we concur entirely. But on two points we hesitate. In the first place we think that it is unfortunate that there should be any reference to doctrine. Some of the practices are clearly repugnant to Catholic doctrine, but in other cases



this is more doubtful,<sup>1</sup> and the suppression of the practices may be made difficult if it is placed on doctrinal grounds. We cannot do better than quote the criticism of the Bishop of Birmingham published in his *Diocesan Magazine* for August.

'The recommendation to which they give the first place is that certain practices which are scheduled as being "plainly significant of teaching repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and certainly illegal, should be promptly made to cease" by the existing authority of the Bishop, or the Courts of Law, without waiting for any change, either of the law or of the Courts. These practices do not, I believe, occur in this diocese. They are, for the most part, such as are plainly excluded by the solemn engagement made by every priest before he can be admitted to any cure of souls, or assistant curacy, or preacher's office, in the Church of England, that "in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, he will use the form in the Prayer Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." But I cannot help wishing that the Commission had based its demand for their prompt suppression in most cases on other than on doctrinal grounds.

'In particular, the practices complained of connected with the consecrated elements seem to me quite consistent with the kind of belief in the "objective real presence," which, in Mr. Bennett's case, was declared by the Privy Council itself to be not repugnant to the formularies of the Church of England. The practices in question are not authorised by the Prayer Book, or by the living authority of our part of the Church, or by the ancient and undivided Church. They ought not to be allowed. But in disallowing them it is of the greatest importance that no suggestion should be made that a doctrine of the Eucharist such as Forbes and Pusey held is to have its legality called in question to-day.

'I hope the Commissioners do not intend any such thing.'

<sup>1</sup> See especially what the Dean of Canterbury says about the doctrine of the Roman Missal (Qs. 18042-18044). We doubt very much whether any of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Roman Missal is necessarily inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England, and have always felt that it provides strong grounds for condemning a good deal of modern Roman and some of the Ritualist teaching referred to in the evidence laid before the Commissioners.

Nor are we convinced that even in these cases prosecutions would be desirable. We hope that those bishops who have such cases to deal with will use the very strongest spiritual influence to check these practices, and will in addition exercise any sort of 'discipline' which they may find possible. If that fails, we think prosecution may be advisable, but we are inclined to think that even here patience will be better in the cases of churches and congregations where such practices have prevailed in the past. In the case of any new church introducing them we should feel that prosecution was entirely justified.

2. Next as to the recommendations with regard to the action of the bishops. The Commissioners recommend the revival of Episcopal visitations. We believe that at this point they touch the really fundamental point. All such action will be truly spiritual, and will be far more effective than anything else. Above all, we would insist on a bishop's visitation being real. The bishop should visit his clergy, not summon the clergy to visit him.

Among the answers of some of the bishops we have been somewhat startled by the suggestion that if they inquired minutely into what the clergy did, they would be acting as spies. We should have thought that it would have been recognized that there should be the most intimate and sympathetic relations between the bishop and all his clergy, and that it should be assumed that he knew accurately the condition of each parish, not by returns which are really useless but by a personal visit. It is his business either in person (at certain times, at any rate, in person), or by his deputies the archdeacon and the rural dean, to inspect the church and its ornaments, to ensure that none of its property has been lost, and that nothing belonging to the church has been illegally taken away or carelessly preserved, that the parson is doing his duty, and performing the services of the Church reverently and completely without neglect or unauthorised additions. A single solemn and dignified visit of a Bishop as Bishop, not merely as an agent for Confirmations or attractive preacher, will have immense influence. We believe that the failure on the part

of our English bishops in recent years to visit properly has very seriously injured the effectiveness of the Church.

The following is the Commissioners' recommendation :

'Episcopal and Archidiaconal visitations and Rural Deans' inspections of churches should be more effectively employed as the regular and official means of keeping the Bishop informed with regard to the conduct of Divine Service in, and the ornaments, objects of decoration, and fittings of, the churches in his diocese. Articles of inquiry in visitation should be framed with a view to elicit this information from the churchwardens. Greater strictness should be used in seeing that such articles are answered, and that any action is taken which the answers may require. Directions in accordance with law given by a Bishop or Archdeacon in visitation as to the conduct of Divine Service and as to the ornaments, objects of decoration, and fittings of churches should be enforceable against incumbents and churchwardens by means of a summary application to the Consistory Court of the diocese. Any order thus made should be subject to appeal to the Provincial Court' (p. 78).

In order to make the action of the bishops effective, the Commissioners recommend certain additions to their powers. The most important is the following:

'In regard to the sanction to be given for the use of additional and special services, collects, and hymns, the law should be so amended as to give wider scope for the exercise of a regulative authority.

'This authority should be exercised within prescribed limits by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces acting together for the sanction and regulation of additional and special services and collects in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer, and for the forbidding of the use of hymns or anthems not in accordance with such teaching.

'The administrative discretion of individual Bishops within the several dioceses should be used in conformity with such sanction and regulations.'

A change in the law—that is to say, a further amendment of the Act of Uniformity—is here suggested. Whether that will be possible or not we cannot say. The House of

Commons is invariably at its worst in discussing ecclesiastical matters and can rarely be persuaded to do anything wise. But it is obviously the right thing for the bishops to act upon this suggestion. It is what they have always done in an unsystematic way. From the seventeenth century onwards they have issued special services and until a legal decision says that 'lawful authority' does not mean the authority of the bishops it will be wise to accept it as such. And if the bishops will act in the way that is suggested they can take their proper place as liturgical leaders. If we ask why the services are performed in this or that way? Why are the younger clergy naturally attracted to this or that form of service? Why are they considered correct? The answer is because there is no other place for them to go for directions. If they were to desire assistance from their bishops they could not have it. For the last seventy years the bishops have entirely confined themselves to telling people what they are not to do. It is now the custom to speak of the improvement in the services which the last half-century has produced. We cannot help remembering that every improvement which has come has been introduced in the first instance against the authority of the bishops. Their action has always been negative. If they are to have any influence, they must be creative, not merely controlling. The only restraint which has been put upon what is described as lawlessness has been by the action of the bishops, and the action of bishops has begun to be effective just because they have begun to take their place as liturgical authorities. The fact that the Bishop of Southwark has written the preface to a book containing special collects, epistles and gospels, edited by a well-known liturgiologist, that Bishops have not only told the clergy what they may not do in relation to the Commemoration of the Departed but also what they may do, has made their influence very much greater. What they have now to do is to help to build up the services of the Church in a sound and healthy and rational way.

We will illustrate what we have to say by referring to

a statement made by the Bishop of Birmingham in his evidence :

‘ I have not the least doubt that in recent years there has grown up what I think is a mistaken attitude towards attendance at the Eucharist apart from communicating, and that is a thing that has got in very deep, and neither I nor anyone else can alter it very rapidly.

‘ But do not you feel it to be your duty to discourage that attitude as far as possible ?—Not to discourage children being taken.

‘ I am referring to the last sentence of your answer—a mistaken attitude towards attendance at the Eucharist apart from communicating ?—Before I was a bishop I wrote a book to try and discourage it. It is a thing that has got very deep into the High Church movement. I personally deplore it deeply, and have publicly deplored it and fought on the subject. But of course, I have a very slight degree of influence, and evidently High Churchmen in my diocese know quite well what my opinion was, but they would also, some of them, no doubt know that they would disagree with me.’<sup>1</sup>

We have quoted these words from the evidence of the Bishop of Birmingham, because they will enable us to illustrate the criticism that we wish to make on the action of the bishops. The question at issue is non-communicating attendance at Holy Communion. The bishop quite rightly, as we believe, vindicates both the legality, and within certain limits, the desirability, of non-communicating attendance, but he is equally strong in condemning the attitude of many of his own friends who have practically introduced what for convenience may be described as the Roman practice of the celebration of Mass, and who, whether they observe the letter of the law or whether they do not, have banished so largely the idea of Communion. Now here we come to what is to our mind the one essential point. With the vindication of the position of the Eucharist as the central act of Christian worship, which has been one of the main results of the Oxford Movement, we should, we need not say, cordially agree ; with the dignified

<sup>1</sup> Q. 15050-15052.

and solemn rendering of that service we are in hearty sympathy; we should be glad to see the frank recognition of the legality of a service which should include the use subject to episcopal licence both of vestments and incense, although we sympathize with those who would prefer a very simple service. But in the manner in which the restored use of the Eucharist has been introduced we think there is a tendency on the part of many High Churchmen to err gravely. But why have they done so? In the first place, because there was a system ready to hand which could be taken over without any trouble, and which seemed to do all that they required. In the next place, because there was no other ideal put before them, and worked out liturgically. Plenty of bishops have told them what they may not do; no bishop, or hardly any, has told them what they should do. Now we know no one who could meet this need better than the Bishop of Birmingham. It is quite true, of course, as he says, that neither he nor anyone else can alter things rapidly. You cannot change the habits of religious thought in which good men have grown up; that is a maxim which everyone ought to remember. But you can put before the younger clergy an ideal, and an ideal worked out in practice, to which they will conform. There is no one who could do this better than the Bishop of Birmingham. He could command the services of the very best modern liturgiologists. There are, we are glad to think, scholars with 'Evangelical' traditions who have begun to study the liturgies, and will help. A great deal of the modern dogmatic liturgiology is often trivial and fails signally to get at sound liturgical principles. What we require is that the Eucharist as it always ought to be should be made the centre of Christian worship, but the Eucharist as implying Communion.

Let us take two instances. Surely the Eucharist should in some way be the adjunct of Christian marriage. That is evidently contemplated by our Prayer Book. It is clearly the right ideal that the newly married couple should receive the Holy Communion together with the priests who have performed the ceremony. But again no



one else at that service is in the same position as they are, and the Communion should be confined to them, though their friends and relations would be glad to be present at the service and join in the prayers for them. Take, again, the Commemoration of the Departed. From the earliest days of the Church the Eucharist has been connected with the memory of the faithful departed, and when the revival of Eucharistic worship began, naturally men turned to the only model that they knew of, and introduced the Requiem Mass. But the Requiem Mass is not the right model. It is undoubtedly connected with the idea of the liberation of souls from purgatory, which is a mediæval and not a primitive belief. Surely an essential element in such a service must be Communion, for in the Communion we are made one with Christ, one with Christ's Body the Church, one with the whole company of the redeemed, one in mystical union with the whole company of the faithful. With those that are dead in Christ we are one in Him. In the Communion, therefore, with the saints who have gone before we commemorate them on earth. But all this is omitted by the modern Requiem, and what the Church requires is the working out of its Eucharistic worship on sounder and more primitive principles.

We have perhaps taken up too much space with this one point, but we are firmly convinced that the only cure for the present-day evils lies in the action of the bishops, and that the bishops will be listened to when they act as bishops. They must begin tentatively, they must not be too frightened of making mistakes. When their action has been found to be successful it can be adopted by the whole Bench. In that way a truly Catholic usage might be established. We quite agree with Lord Halifax when he demands that 'the English Bishops' should assert 'their position as Catholic Bishops'; only, so far as we can gather, his definition of a Catholic Bishop is one who agrees with himself.

There is one further reason why we have emphasized this point—because it is the crucial point of the whole discussion. Anyone who reads carefully through the evidence of the representatives of 'Evangelical' opinion will see



that what they are really frightened at is 'the Mass,' as an artificial external system. Now on this point we find the Bishop of Birmingham, of whose position as a Churchman there can be no doubt, on the same side with them. What they object to is the spectacular service, and the distinctive characteristic of the spectacular service is that the congregation do not communicate. Now the important point to notice is that such a service is not illegal: provided that there are three communicants all legal requirements are fulfilled. The law might be rigidly enforced, and incense, vestments, and certain details of ritual given up, but by the use of music and hymns a very ornate service might be retained. We believe, therefore, that the basis for conciliation in the future is the development of a truer and more primitive ideal of Eucharistic worship, and if that is attained the difficulty as to whether the service is to be ornate or Puritan in its character will be found to be capable of adjustment.

Two other recommendations in regard to the action of bishops we will content ourselves with quoting:

'Bishops should be invested with power to refuse the institution or admission of a presentee into a benefice who has not previously satisfied the Bishop of the diocese of his willingness to obey the law as to the conduct of Divine Service and as to the ornaments and fittings of churches, and to submit to directions given by the Bishop in accordance with Recommendation 3.<sup>1</sup>

'A Bishop should have power at any time, by an order or monition made by himself or by his Chancellor, after due opportunity to be heard on the matter has been given to the incumbent and churchwardens and any other persons whom the Bishop or his Chancellor (as the case may be) may direct, to order the removal of ornaments, objects of decoration, or fittings placed in a church, as to which ornaments, objects, or fittings no faculty has been obtained, and to provide for the disposal of such ornaments, objects, or fittings when removed. A Bishop should have a *locus standi* in his Consistory Court in all faculty cases affecting the ornaments, objects of decoration, or fittings of churches in his diocese' (pp. 77-8).

As a necessary corollary to what has been said about

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 31. 'In regard to the sanction, &c.'

the work of bishops, a considerable increase in the number of dioceses is recommended :

‘ For the purposes of effective supervision and administration, it is desirable that many dioceses should be subdivided ; and that a general Act providing machinery for the creation of new dioceses by Order in Council should be passed so as to prevent the necessity of the enactment of a separate statute on the formation of each new diocese ’ ( p. 79 ).

With the paramount importance of this we need not say that we concur absolutely.

3. We pass now to the recommendations in regard to Ecclesiastical Courts. The above recommendations have implied that very considerable administrative power should be entrusted to the bishops, but the action of bishops must not be arbitrary. The bishop has only canonical authority. The clergy must always have the protection of the proper courts, and the present courts are admitted to be unsatisfactory. We have referred already to the principles that should guide legislation in this matter, and must confine ourselves at present to quoting the recommendations of the Commission :

‘ The recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission in 1883, as to the constitution of the Diocesan and Provincial Courts and of the Court of Final Appeal should be carried into effect with one modification, namely, to substitute for the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission quoted in paragraph 368 of our Report, the following :

‘ Where, in an appeal before the Final Court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine or use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the Court, such question shall be referred to an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit ; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the Court for the purposes of the said appeal ( pp. 77-78 ).

4. But, lastly, it is evident that definite legislation is required. The regulations with regard to Divine Service are not clear, and do not meet the needs of the present day. Legislation, therefore, by Convocation is recommended.

We have not space at present to do more than quote the suggestion, while briefly pointing out the important points in it. It is recommended that the two Houses should meet together, and that the Houses of Laymen should be consulted. That is, we have definite public recognition for the first time of the efforts which have been made by the Church to obtain adequate expression of its living voice. If the Church acts both boldly and wisely it will be found that what it does will be endorsed by the State. Law in this country always lags behind.

'Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations with instructions: (a) to consider the preparation of a new rubric regulating the ornaments (that is to say, the vesture) of the ministers of the Church, at the times of their ministrations, with a view to its enactment by Parliament; and (b) to frame, with a view to their enactment by Parliament, such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of churches as may tend to secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand.

'It would be most desirable for the early dealing with these important subjects that the Convocations should sit together, and we assume that they would take counsel with the Houses of Laymen', (p. 77).

Our article has extended to such a length that we have little room to say anything in conclusion. We hope that we shall have convinced our readers that the Commissioners have done their work ably and impartially; that the evidence given does not shew any signs (except in very few churches) of what is disloyal, or unhealthy, or unsound in the Church, but that it does shew that the whole machinery of the Church needs adjustment to the conditions of the present day; that their recommendations are wise, and calculated to meet far wider needs than those that they

particularly concern themselves with. Whether anything in the way of legislation will come out of it we cannot say. We hope it may. We can conceive nothing more calculated to do good than for the next Conservative Government to begin a rational reform of the Church of England on the lines here laid down. We can hardly hope, however, that any Minister will be bold enough to undertake such a task. But in any case the essence of the Report is that the difficulties of the time cannot be settled by antiquarian research, but by an appeal to the living voice of the Church, and it is only when that voice is allowed to speak clearly and effectively that it will be possible for the Church adequately to perform its duties in the country at the present day.

---

#### ART. II.—GREGORY THE GREAT.

*Gregory the Great ; his Place in History and Thought.* By F. HOMES DUDDEN, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. Two volumes. (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1905.)

'DEUS qui nos in tantis periculis constitutos pro humana scis fragilitate non posse subsistere, da nobis salutem mentis et corporis, ut ea quae pro peccatis nostris patimur te adiuuante uincamus.'

'O GOD, who knowest us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers, that by reason of the frailty of our nature we cannot always stand upright ; give to us such strength of mind and body, that those things which for our sins we suffer by thy help we may overcome.'

THIS Collect for the Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany has been attributed to Gregory the Great as its author. It would be difficult to find words more apt to describe his own bodily weakness and suffering, and the political dangers of the city of Rome. The world around him was full of threats and violence ; distress of nations, with perplexity ; men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking

unto those things which were coming on the earth. Seeing the fulfilment of almost all of the prophesied signs, Gregory himself understood that the end of all things was at hand. In his own person he was racked with pain, now of gout, now of stomach and bowels; he could not always stand upright; nay, for months together he had to lie writhing on his couch, while he dictated the letters which carried his words, sometimes persuasive, sometimes vehement, and communicated his powerful will, to remote parts of the earth. It was from the midst of the gloom of such circumstances that he sent Augustine to found the English National Church, the *Ecclesia Anglorum* as he himself called it, while as yet England was not a nation. It is not always in the most prosperous times of the Church of Christ, it is not always by the most robust men, that the best work is done for God and for man.

This great man it is whom Mr. Dudden makes to live in the nine hundred pages of his handsome volumes. The work has evidently been a labour of love, as well as a labour of conspicuous industry. Mr. Dudden has made almost exhaustive use of that treasure-house of fact and of thought, the 'Letters of Gregory the Great.' The analysis of the Letters has been rendered not easy only but fascinating by the sumptuous edition of them published with a luxury of apparatus by the German *Societas aperiendis fontibus* &c. The first part was issued at Berlin in 1887 under the editorship of Paul Ewald, the four remaining parts in 1891-99 by L. M. Hartmann. A close examination of the Letters shews that Mr. Dudden has used them with great skill and accuracy, and in his renderings has put them before his readers with graphic force. Praise of like kind is due to his analysis of most of the voluminous treatises of Gregory, the *Dialogues*, the *Homilies on Ezechiel* and *on the Gospels*, the *Morals*, the *Pastoral Care*, and some others of doubtful authorship.

A very considerable portion of the volumes is of necessity occupied by the doings of the Goths and Lombards and Gauls. The large extent to which historical details of the earlier history of these peoples are given is perhaps open to

criticism. Some of the grosser parts of the story might with advantage, and without loss, have been omitted. But really there is so much that is attractive in the book that the reader is put by it into a non-critical frame of mind.

It would be easy to fill the space at our disposal, and much more, with discussions of the position of Gregory as Patriarch and as Pope in the West; of his contentions with the Easterns in regard to their rival title of Universal Bishop; of his statesmanship in secular and spiritual affairs; of his intervention even in military arrangements; of his management of the enormous estates and revenues of the Papacy; of his English mission. In each and all of these aspects Gregory is a great, a remarkable, figure. When all are put together, it may fairly be said that not many men known to history have filled so large a place and filled it so importantly. On all these points Mr. Dudden is painstaking and full; but a good deal of what we have mentioned is common knowledge, and it may be an advantage, therefore, to consider the great Pope rather as a man and as the mind of mediævalism.

In wretched health, as we have seen, tried by much physical pain, his own surroundings enough to break the spirit of any but the strongest of men; with all his sore trials, Gregory the Great was never weary of well doing. He was called upon to rule the Church of Rome at one of the very darkest of its many times of trial. Pestilence was rife; it had carried off his predecessor. Italy was overrun by enemies—was indeed its own chief enemy. The celibate life, it has been suggested, had found so many adherents that the native Italian defenders were comparatively few; children were not born in sufficient numbers to fill the gaps of pestilence and war. Husbandry was over large areas abandoned. The distress was so great, so universal, that the conviction was held in the highest quarters, it was large in the mind of Gregory himself, that these were the fearful sights and great signs which were to herald the end of the world.

And even more than by these secular troubles was he who then ruled the Roman Church tried by ecclesiastical



difficulties. Arianism, far from being at an end, was dominant or threatening wherever the Goths and the Lombards were; and where were they not? Donatism was once again raising its head in Africa, and lifting its hands of violence. Controversies a hundred and fifty years old, of Nestorian character, were breaking into fresh life, threatening fresh divisions of the seamless robe of Christ. Gregory's own position, as he estimated it—that, namely, of supreme head on earth of the Church which was the supreme head of all the Churches—was covertly and even openly questioned by Constantinople. He thus described the Church he ruled:—‘an old and battered ship; leaking on all sides; its timbers rotten; shaken by daily storms; sounding of wreck.’

Gregory was intended to fill an important secular position in succession to his father, who was one of the wealthiest of the Roman aristocracy. He was educated accordingly, and was trained to be a man of the world, and of affairs. This training stood him in good stead in all of the varied positions which he held one after another; specially, perhaps, that part of the training which made him familiar with the principles of jurisprudence and the details of legal questions. It was probably on account of the skill and knowledge which he shewed in these respects as a Senator that he was raised when quite young to the chief secular position in the city. In the year 573, when the Lombard king was doing his worst to root out the Roman patricians, Gregory, at the age of 33, became Urban Prefect. As such he was the head of the Senate, convened its assemblies, had the right to speak first. When any member of the Senate was tried, the Urban Prefect presided at the trial. He was privileged to wear the imperial purple, and to ride in state through the streets of Rome, drawn by four horses gorgeously caparisoned. He had supreme civil and criminal jurisdiction, not only within the city, but to a distance of a hundred miles from the Capitol. The ultimate control of all the important secular affairs of the city was in him. All of the principal officials of the city reported to him as their chief, the census officers, the collectors of taxes, the superintendents of markets and granaries, the curators



of public works, the heads of the police. His title was *Illustrissimus*.

But besides this secular training, Gregory was brought up in a religious atmosphere and in the precepts of religion. He was the child of pious parents. His mother was the Saint Silvia whose chapel is still seen close by the Church of S. Gregorio Magno, itself superposed upon the great palace of his father Gordianus on the Celian Hill. Three of his paternal aunts were devoted to the religious life. He himself loved to meditate upon the Scriptures, and to listen attentively to the conversation of his elders. In June 597, a fateful date for England, he wrote to the lady in charge of the imperial princes, her nephews, 'the words of those who bring up children will be as milk if they be good, as poison if evil.' 'Let those who attend to them now put such thoughts into their minds, that the future may shew how excellent were the things which they learned from the mouth of those who brought them up.' His knowledge of the Scriptures was singularly complete and detailed; his great enthusiasm for the Bible was commensurate with his knowledge of it, as is indeed usually the case. It is not those who know the Bible that belittle it. He tells us that he used both the Old Latin version and the Vulgate; Greek, he tells us, he did not know, even after a residence of seven years in Constantinople. He combats in his writings the idea that the Bible is a book for the clergy, from which they are to instruct the laity. It is meant, he declares, to instruct all, clergy and laity; and to instruct directly, not only through others. It, not the expounder of it, teaches man to know God. It, not the commentator, answers the spiritual inquiries of every individual. It is adapted, it does not need adapting, to every kind of mind and character; so that every man can learn from it the lessons he most needs. He is never tired of urging the clergy to study their Bible; and he is eager to impress this as a duty upon laymen too. In June 595 he wrote as follows to Theodore, the Emperor's physician, whose friendship he had acquired during his sojourn at Constantinople:

'He loves most who most presumes. I have a certain complaint with regard to the most sweet mind of my most glorious

son the Lord Theodore. Though he has received the gift of genius, the gift of fortune, the gift of sympathy and charity from the Holy Trinity, he yet is unceasingly engaged in secular affairs, is occupied in assiduous Court functions, and neglects to read daily the words of his Redeemer. What is Holy Scripture but a letter from God Omnipotent to His creature? Of a surety, though your gloriousness should be ever so occupied with other matters, if you were to receive a letter from your earthly sovereign, you would not delay, you would not rest, you would not let your eyelids slumber, until you had learned what your earthly Emperor had written. The Emperor of Heaven, the Lord of men and of angels, has sent to you for the safety of your life His own letters; and yet, my glorious son, you neglect to read those same letters with burning zeal. Be eager, I beg you, and daily meditate the words of your Creator. Learn in the words of God the heart of God, that you may the more ardently sigh for eternal things, that your mind may be inflamed with greater desire for celestial joys. For then will its rest in the world to come be the greater because here from loving its Creator it has known no rest. That you may so do, may the Omnipotent God pour into you the Spirit, the Comforter; may He fill your mind with His presence; and, in filling, lighten.'

Gregory soon gave up his original purpose of life, which was, to live as a religious layman, doing secular work in the religious spirit. His father had died and left to him his large property; his mother had 'entered religion.' He converted his ancestral palace on the Celian into a monastery dedicated to St. Andrew, founding also five monasteries in Sicily, where the bulk of his property lay. He became a monk in his own monastery of St. Andrew, and in after years he wrote with pathetic regret of the peace and quiet of the contemplative life he there spent. He was not left long in that quiet place. In 577 the Lombards were capturing one town after another, and Rome was threatened. The Emperor, Justin II., could give no help from Constantinople; he advised the Romans to bribe some of the Lombard Dukes to oppose those who were threatening Rome, and if that failed, to bribe the Franks to come into Italy and fight the Lombards. All was blank despair. War and famine had sorely reduced the Roman population

in town and country. The Lombard Duke of Spoleto laid siege to Rome. The plague raged in the city. The Tiber rose till a second Deluge appeared to be imminent. Pope Benedict died in July, 578; in November, Pelagius II. was elected and hurriedly consecrated without the imperial sanction. One of these two Popes, probably Benedict, brought Gregory out of the cloister in this distressful year and ordained him the Seventh Deacon of Rome. The Seven Deacons were practically the most eminent ecclesiastics about the Papal Chair, the inner council of the Pope, the managers of the Seven Regions of Rome. It is a singular testimony to the skill which Gregory had shown in his rule as Prefect of the City, that at this all but desperate crisis he should be taken from the cloister and put into this place of the very highest responsibility. The ravages of the Lombards had brought the Senate and the patricians of Rome to so low an ebb that the Bishop of Rome and his council had become the most important factor in the defence of the city. The Exarch at Ravenna had enough to do to hold his own and defend his port of Classis; and the country between Ravenna and Rome was in the hands of the Lombards, so that the Exarch could not have sent help even if he could have spared troops.

Seeing the great ability of Gregory as a controller of the highest concerns, Pelagius determined to send him at the head of a powerful embassy to Constantinople, there to make a persistent effort to induce the Emperor to send troops and an able general to check the Lombard armies in their career of triumph. Little or nothing came of the embassy; but Gregory remained in Constantinople for seven years in the capacity of *Apocrisarius*, or *Responsalis*, as the Pope's ambassador at the imperial court, in charge of the communications (*responsa*) which passed between the Pope and the Emperor, was named officially. Thus in six years, nearly four of which were spent in the cloister, Gregory was promoted to three great offices in succession, Urban Prefect, Seventh Deacon, Apocrisarius. His age at the last of these steps was only 39, some say only 37.

Gregory's six years of residence at the Court of Constantinople taught him all that was to be learned of Court life and Court methods. But he saw the Court under singularly favourable conditions, very different indeed from those which are usually associated with the lives of Emperors of the East and their families. It is almost necessary to quote here the words in which Gibbon, no flatterer of public characters and no veiler of private vices, describes the Emperor, one of the tallest and most comely of the Romans, to whom Gregory was sent as ambassador.

'With the odious name of Tiberius, he assumed the more popular appellation of Constantine, and imitated the purer virtues of the Antonines. After recording the vice and folly of so many Roman princes, it is pleasing to repose, for a moment, on a character conspicuous by the qualities of humanity, justice, temperance, and fortitude; to contemplate a sovereign affable in his palace, pious in the church, impartial on the seat of judgment, and victorious, at least by his generals, in the Persian War. The most glorious trophy of his victory consisted in a multitude of captives, whom Tiberius entertained, redeemed, and dismissed to their native homes, with the charitable spirit of a Christian hero. . . . His wise and equitable laws excited the praise and regret of succeeding times.'

For four of his six years in Constantinople, Tiberius was the Emperor with whom Gregory had to deal. His mission was a failure, in that he could not obtain armed support against the Lombards who threatened to drive the Latins out of Rome, but in other respects it was an education. Gregory made many friends in the Palace, and evidently learned to understand the great difficulties of the position, with powerful Orientals, Persians and Turks and Moors, dominating the Eastern approaches of Constantinople, while Western heretics were thundering at the gates of Rome. Gregory's attitude to one of the succeeding Emperors is the one serious charge which has been brought against the moral character or the moral courage of the Pope. The episode occurred very near the end of his life, and it is impossible to pass it by without remark.

The Emperor Maurice stands out as a bright example of

public and private virtue, and it was he who sanctioned Gregory's elevation to the Papal throne. He was overthrown by Phocas, an almost unique specimen of public and private vice. Maurice and five of his sons were taken down to the harbour of Chalcedon. The boys were beheaded one after another in their father's presence, down to a little infant. Maurice was then beheaded, and the bodies were thrown into the sea. The oldest son, who was absent, was followed and killed; for him Gregory had stood sponsor in 584. The Empress and her three little daughters were executed three years later, two years after Gregory's death. Phocas was crowned on November 23, 602, and on April 25, 603, the formal embassy, bearing the icon of Phocas and his wife Leontia, reached Rome. In the following month Gregory wrote the letter which has met with such severe condemnation. It must be remembered that he was an old and broken-down man. It has even been suggested that he did not know of the murder of his friend Maurice and the children in whom he had taken so much interest; but the slaughter of Maurice and all his sons and his chief supporters was precisely set forth in the formal announcement which accompanied the icon. He probably did not know the vileness of the character of Phocas, who had not been before the world as a postulant for the sovereignty. But none of these suggestions can soften the hard fact that he openly rejoiced over the death of Maurice. This can only have been in adulation of the new Emperor; it appears to be the most unworthy part of a very unworthy business. Gregory wrote thus:

'Glory to God in the Highest! to God who changeth seasons and transferreth kingdoms, and hath made clear to all that the Most High is Lord in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whom He will. . . . Sometimes . . . He raises one man to the supreme power, and by the clemency of that one pours the grace of the divine power into the hearts of all. With this gladness we trust that we shall all be abundantly strengthened, we who rejoice that the Benignity of your Piety has attained to the summit of Imperial greatness. Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad; and may all the people of the Empire,

hitherto terribly afflicted, exult in your kindly deeds. May the proud hearts of your enemies be bowed under the yoke of your dominion. May the saddened and dejected spirits of your subjects be cheered by your clemency. . . . Under the yoke of your fatherly government may each regain the liberty that is his due.'

Two months later, eight months after the massacre, Gregory must have known the details of the slaughter and must have heard of the character of Phocas ; and yet he wrote, in July 603, a letter which commenced thus :

'We are free to think, with rejoicings and great giving of thanks, what praises we owe to the Almighty, who has taken away the yoke of sadness and brought us to times of liberty under the Imperial Piety of your Benignity.'

and ended thus :

'We trust in Almighty God that the good things of His comfort which He has begun He will accomplish, and that now He has raised up pious rulers in the commonwealth He will blot out its cruel enemies. May the Holy Trinity therefore preserve your life through long years, that the benefit of your piety, so late received, we may long enjoy.'

It may be suggested on Gregory's side that this was a sort of 'common form' for gratulations to a new Emperor, the parts referring to past gloom being common form for the numerous cases of accession by violence. It is evident, too, that Gregory had a tremendous respect for the Imperial authority in itself. This is what he wrote to Theoctista, the sister of the Emperor Maurice, when the Emperor's sanction of his election to the Papacy arrived after long delays—the Emperor, be it remembered, over whose slaughter he came in the end to rejoice :

'Lo, the most serene lord, the Emperor, has ordered an ape to be made a lion. And, indeed, in accordance with that command, the ape can be called a lion, but made a lion he cannot be. Wherefore all my faults and negligences he must impute not to me but to his Piety, for he has committed the ministry of power to one that is weak.'



It is almost tempting to suggest that the epithet 'Gregorian' might replace that of 'Erastian.'

But it is worth while to consider how far the spirit of the age accounts for Gregory's attitude to Phocas. We have an account of proceedings at Constantinople during his sojourn there, written by the contemporary ecclesiastical historian, the lawyer Evagrius. An official at Antioch, one Anatolius, was detected in the practice of magical sacrificial rites. He bribed his judge, the Governor of the East, and would have been acquitted had not the populace demanded his execution and forced the judge to pronounce sentence of condemnation. For a special reason he and his accomplices were brought to Constantinople and examined there. Some of them received sentence of banishment instead of death, and this disappointment so inflamed the populace of Constantinople that 'with a sort of divine zeal,' Evagrius says, they seized the banished culprits, put them into a boat, and burned them alive. Anatolius himself was sent to the amphitheatre, and Evagrius describes his fate with the precision of an impartial eye-witness. He was first exposed to wild beasts and mangled by them—a very graphic touch. He was then thrust upon a sharp stake and impaled, still alive. Even that did not end his sufferings, for—another very graphic touch—the wolves tore down the body and divided it as a feast among themselves, a thing never before noticed, Evagrius says; he evidently knew all about the ways of wolves with victims in the amphitheatre. We should of course like to be able to say that Gregory indignantly condemned these shocking barbarities. But he was not in advance of his age. He was a firm believer in the power of magicians and sorcerers, whom he took to be the worst enemies of God. He believed that if the people permitted magicians to live, the Divine vengeance would fall upon the whole community. The sorcerer Basilius, he says in one of his Dialogues, lived in Rome; he adds, with evident approval, 'the zeal of the Christian people rose to such a height that he was burned alive.'

In mediæval times in our own land, an unpopular minister  
VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

E



was beheaded, not dismissed. Gregory's letters to Phocas—it may be suggested for consideration—would by proportional contrast correspond very nearly to the action of some important personage who should write a letter of hearty congratulation to a Prime Minister on his being put into office by a general election, conducted—if such a thing should ever be possible among us—upon nefarious principles.

In looking for reasons to account for Gregory's attitude of mind with regard to the murdered Emperor, it is perhaps too human to suggest that Maurice had on one occasion offended him beyond forgiveness. Eight years before his adulation of Phocas he had begun an angry reply to a justifiably angry letter from Maurice, in 595, thus :—' In his most serene commands, my religious Lord while reproving me for certain things, appeared indeed to spare me, but in reality spared me not at all. In his courtesy he called me simple, but in fact he called me a fool.'

To have to reside at the Court of the largest, most wealthy, and gayest city of the world at that time was indeed a strange fate for a man whose ideal was a cloistered life of prayer, study, and meditation. In the midst of exacting Court ceremonials, of incessant intrigues and jealousies, of multitudinous business affairs, transacted with ecclesiastical and secular officials who thought more of their own ambitions than of the welfare of the Church and the Empire, Gregory's heart was in the cloister. Whenever opportunity offered, he took refuge there. He had been accompanied to Constantinople by a number of his former companions, monks of St. Andrew's, and they lived in monastic seclusion. It was their companionship which made his life endurable. Writing in later times of their presence in the Imperial city, he said :—

' I see that this was ordered for me by Divine Providence, that when I was driven to and fro by the constant buffeting of worldly business, I might by their example be anchored, as it were, to the firm shore of prayer. To their society I fled as to a harbour of perfect safety, and while I was employed with them in the careful study and discussion of Scripture, the yearnings of penitence daily gave me life.'

It was under these conditions that Gregory prepared and delivered in the cloister a series of lectures on the Book of Job, afterwards published with the title of *Magna Moralia*. This remarkable book, which had a supreme influence upon the mediæval Church, has been published in English in the *Library of the Fathers*. It fills more than 1,900 octavo pages of moderate-sized type; and the diversity of material is so great, that the English index occupies about 200 pages of small print. When he returned to Rome, and had become abbat of the monastery which he had founded on and in his father's palace, Gregory revised and greatly added to these lectures, and they became an encyclopædia of theology, philosophy, and morals. After he had reached the Papal Chair, he wrote a preface dedicating the work to Leander of Seville, of whom he begged that if he found it in parts languid or unpolished, he would understand that when he wrote such parts the pain of his body was clouding the powers of his mind. This is what he had to say :

'Many a year's circuit has gone by since first I began to be afflicted with frequent pains in the bowels. The powers of my stomach are broken down, and at all times and seasons I am weak. Oppressed by fevers, slow, but in constant succession, I draw my breath with difficulty. It may be that this is by the design of divine Providence, that I a stricken one should set forth Job stricken, and by reason of these scourges should more perfectly enter into the feelings of one that was scourged.'

In his interpretations of the Book of Job Gregory proceeds on the threefold method. This was, of course, far from originating with him; indeed it may be said of him not unfairly that in most of his writings his mind chiefly made fertile use of what other minds had originated.

'First we lay the historical foundations; next, by pursuing the typical sense, we erect a fabric of the mind, to be a stronghold of faith; and, as a last step, by the grace of moral instruction we clothe the edifice with a cast of colouring.'

One of the sayings of his preface has almost become

proverbial. It is a good example of his readiness of illustration :

‘As the word of God, by the mysteries which it contains, exercises the understandings of the wise, so, by what presents itself on the surface, it nurtures the simple-minded. . . . It is as it were a kind of river, if I may so liken it, which is both shallow and deep ; wherein both the lamb may find a footing, and the elephant may float at large.’

His allegories are sometimes very striking, and sometimes also they are very queer. Their queerness accounts for a great deal of the queerness of mediæval lucubrations. Job’s seven sons meant the twelve Apostles ; for seven is made up of three and four, and whether you multiply three by four, or four by three, seven is changed into twelve. And the Apostles were twelve in number because they had to preach the Three Persons of the Trinity to the four quarters of the globe. Job’s three thousand camels give the commentator an opportunity for using in a graphic way the experience, which no doubt had been his, of seeing camels coming with their humps and their ungainly gait to Constantinople, with cargoes of pagan goods from the East.

‘We understand by the camels the Gentile people, crooked in their ways, and laden with idolatrous ceremonies. Because they devised them gods of their own selves, there has grown up as it were out of themselves a load upon their back, which they must carry.’

In the opening paragraphs of his commentary, Gregory affords us a good example of the use he so often makes of St. Augustine’s ideas. St. Augustine had said that the Apostles were the hands, which wrote down what Christ, the Head, dictated. Gregory says :

‘Who was the writer of the Book of Job it is quite superfluous to inquire, since in any case the Holy Spirit is confidently believed to have been the author. He who dictated the things that should be written, Himself wrote them. If we were reading the words of some great man with a letter of his in our hand, we should not inquire with what pen were they written. . . .

When, then, we are persuaded that the Holy Spirit was the author of the book, to stir the question who was the writer is the same thing as in reading a letter to inquire about the pen.'

In most cases the *Magna Moralia* is so lengthily written that self-contained extracts of convenient dimensions are difficult to find. Just one unusually concise example of Gregory's illustrative and logical method may be given :

'*So they sat down with him upon the ground seven days and seven nights.* Whether they sat with the afflicted Job for seven days and seven nights together, or possibly kept by him in assiduous and frequent visiting for that length of time, we cannot say. We are often said to be doing something for so many days, though not continuously busied therein. And Holy Scripture often puts a part for the whole, or the whole for a part. Thus it speaks of a part for the whole when it says in describing Jacob's household *All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were three score and ten.* Here, while it mentions only souls, it clearly includes bodies. Again it puts the whole for a part, as where at the tomb Mary complains *They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.* It was the Body only of the Lord that she had come to seek ; and yet she bewails the Lord as though His whole Person had been altogether taken away.'

If we are to attempt to explain the popularity of Gregory's writings, in contrast with the position held by the works of Augustine of Hippo, from whom he derived his views of the Christian Church and of Christian doctrine, the explanation appears to lie first in the modernness of Gregory ; next in the directness and plainness of his statements and of his processes of reasoning ; and then in the fact that he expands in an illustrative way Augustine's views. Augustine is subtle, often difficult to follow : Gregory is obvious. He writes for the most part almost bluntly, and with the air of a man whose aim was to make himself understood. It must be added, in simple honesty, that there is a much smaller gap between the ordinary intellect and the method of Gregory than there is between the ordinary intellect and the method and mind of Augustine.

Another work of Gregory served to make his name very popular in the Middle Ages, and stamped its character indelibly on the popular belief. In the Eastern Churches it was so well liked that Gregory was known among them by its name, 'Gregory of the Dialogue.' It is a collection of stories of miracles done in Italy by Christian Fathers and Saints. We may understand that Gregory was in the habit of relating these stories in conversation, to such an extent that his friends begged him to write them down, and have them multiplied by scribes, that they might not be lost, and that a larger circle might be made acquainted with them. He took pains about it, as he always did take pains with what he had to do. We have a letter of his, written in July 593, to the Bishop of Syracuse, Maximianus, whom he had twice made Abbat of St. Andrew's, asking him to send some stories he had heard him tell, but the details of which he had forgotten :

'The brethren about me are pressing me to write a brief account of the miracles which we have heard that the Fathers in Italy have done. I greatly need your help in this. Send me short accounts of all that you can remember, and of all that you have yourself known. I remember that you once told me of some miracles done by the lord abbat Nonnosus, or Nonnus, who was with the lord Anastasius at the monastery of Mount Soracte.'

The belief in detailed miracles, in quite small incidents of the daily life, engendered by these stories, was no doubt a consolation to men tried as the men of that age and of later ages were tried. It gave them a very vivid sense of the reality of divine help. If a man who did not believe in them had written them with the purpose of producing this indirect effect, we should naturally condemn his action as immoral. But Gregory most firmly believed the stories which he wrote down, stories of visions which effected some real revelation of facts, stories of prophecies which came true, stories of miracles wrought. It has been acutely noted that the wonders are represented as happening to the orthodox, many of them to frustrate the malice of Arian heretics and of idolaters, so that we may, perhaps,

conclude that Gregory had a controversial purpose, not in collecting the stories, but in making his selection.

The book is written in the form of a dialogue between himself and a subdeacon Peter. Peter is usually blunt, solid, and stolid. He states his doubts and disbeliefs in such a way as best to bring out Gregory's points. As usual in controversial dialogues written for a purpose, one wishes that the weaker of the two had made things a little harder for the stronger.

As regards visions, Gregory does not press their miraculous character in all cases. Some, he frankly and materialistically confesses, are due to repletion or emptiness of the stomach, and to other causes which are far from being divine revelation. An example will shew how easily a man was credited with a vision. A pious shoemaker worked hard on five days of the week, and on *Saturdays* distributed to the poor at St. Peter's all that he could spare from his earnings. A friend of his had a vision. He saw a house being built for the shoemaker in heaven, the heavenly builders working on *Saturdays* and on no other days. That was all. Of the prophecies, many are very trifling. Those attributed to St. Benedict are of another order, and are too well known to be quoted here. The miracles are in large measure those which we read of as occurring in monasteries and elsewhere all through the Middle Ages—broken things, including heads, mended; provisions supplied; sick persons healed; dead persons raised. Here is one. Florentius of Norcia found his cell beset by innumerable snakes. He prayed to God to relieve him of the pest. Thereupon it thundered, and all the snakes were killed. Florentius, evidently an indolent person, not easily satisfied even by miracle, exclaimed—'Behold, Lord, Thou hast killed them all; but who is to carry them away?' At once a flock of birds flew up, and each carried off a serpent. It is very easy to see this story growing from a natural beginning as it passed from one mouth to another. A flash of lightning, a dead snake, a hungry crow.

Gregory takes great pains to state the evidence for his



many stories. But the evidence which satisfied his uncritical mind is for the most part weak. Further, it must be supposed that he would specially welcome stories of miracles done under his own eyes, or under the eyes of his companions—and in Rome itself, where those who had seen the miracle could vouch for it, and those who doubted could make local inquiry. But Mr. Dudden finds only two Roman miracles, one being the healing of a lunatic, to which reference is made below, and the other the healing of a paralytic; whereas of the visions recorded nearly one half are ascribed to persons living in Rome. The criticism thus suggested is severe. Nevertheless the book is of the very greatest interest, for it tells us incidentally a great deal about just those ordinary circumstances of the time which no historian would have thought it worth while to tell. The historian of course tells of striking things, and passes over in natural silence the very things we should often much rather know about: namely, how the world went with ordinary folk in the times of which he is writing. Gregory's Dialogues are a mine of such things.

It should be added that the one Roman example of a miraculous healing of a lunatic is at once an example of a non-miraculous miracle and of Gregory's extreme incapacity as a judge of evidence. There was a presbyter, Aman-tius, in a wild district of the diocese of Tivoli, of whose miraculous power, exercised by laying on of hands upon the sick and using the sign of the cross over noxious reptiles, great accounts reached Gregory's ears. He summoned the miraculous presbyter to Rome, and shut him up in a hospital with many patients to see what would happen. Aman-tius remained there many days, without visible miracle; but at last, by prayer and laying on of hands, he calmed the frenzies of a patient who was deranged. 'From this one act of his,' Gregory says, 'I learned to believe all the stories that I had heard of him.'

Gregory was the last of the four great Latin Doctors, and being the latest he is the most mediæval. We must credit him with the chief share in the development of the doctrines which had vogue in the Dark Ages. From him



more than from anyone else, mostly because he more than anyone else was read in those times of darkness by men who wrote treatises and by men who did not write, the mediæval beliefs in purgatory came. The Orthodox Church of the East frankly denies that there is such a state as the Roman purgatory; in this, as in so many cases, the 'unchanging' East condemns the changing Roman West. Gregory held that no sin can be left unpunished. He meant more than is meant by the proverbial statement that every sin brings its own penalty. 'God,' he said, 'never spares the offender, in that He never leaves a fault without taking vengeance on it. Either man by penance punishes it in himself, or God assists man to punish it.' Good works are a compensation, a balance, for sins, so he held. In themselves, he agreed with Augustine, they are insufficient to balance sins; it is only when supplemented by God's mercy that they avail. Not in our tears, not in our deeds, but in the pleading of our Advocate must be our trust. And, further, penance may begin in fear, some of his phrases suggest directly that it *must* begin in fear; but—it must end in love. It is these final touches, that only if the expiatory pleading of the Saviour be given, and only if in the course of penance we pass from fearing God to loving God, which redeem the theory from the charge of being one of mere mechanical equivalents—penances, and penitential thought and action, an equivalent for sin.

Some, at least, of those whom he taught were naturally anxious to know when they had done enough. In June 597, Gregory wrote to the chamberwoman of one of the imperial princesses, who had written to accuse herself of a multitude of sins, and to entreat him to tell her that the forgiveness of her sins had been revealed to him. To the first part of her letter he replied by dwelling upon the life of the Magdalene. To the latter part he replied that her request was difficult and useless: difficult because he was not worthy of a revelation; and useless because she ought never to feel secure about her sins, never cease to weep for them till the very last day of her life, and then only because she would be too ill to make lamentation. She

many stories. But the evidence which satisfied his uncritical mind is for the most part weak. Further, it must be supposed that he would specially welcome stories of miracles done under his own eyes, or under the eyes of his companions—and in Rome itself, where those who had seen the miracle could vouch for it, and those who doubted could make local inquiry. But Mr. Dudden finds only two Roman miracles, one being the healing of a lunatic, to which reference is made below, and the other the healing of a paralytic; whereas of the visions recorded nearly one half are ascribed to persons living in Rome. The criticism thus suggested is severe. Nevertheless the book is of the very greatest interest, for it tells us incidentally a great deal about just those ordinary circumstances of the time which no historian would have thought it worth while to tell. The historian of course tells of striking things, and passes over in natural silence the very things we should often much rather know about: namely, how the world went with ordinary folk in the times of which he is writing. Gregory's Dialogues are a mine of such things.

It should be added that the one Roman example of a miraculous healing of a lunatic is at once an example of a non-miraculous miracle and of Gregory's extreme incapacity as a judge of evidence. There was a presbyter, Aman-tius, in a wild district of the diocese of Tivoli, of whose miraculous power, exercised by laying on of hands upon the sick and using the sign of the cross over noxious reptiles, great accounts reached Gregory's ears. He summoned the miraculous presbyter to Rome, and shut him up in a hospital with many patients to see what would happen. Aman-tius remained there many days, without visible miracle; but at last, by prayer and laying on of hands, he calmed the frenzies of a patient who was deranged. 'From this one act of his,' Gregory says, 'I learned to believe all the stories that I had heard of him.'

Gregory was the last of the four great Latin Doctors, and being the latest he is the most mediæval. We must credit him with the chief share in the development of the doctrines which had vogue in the Dark Ages. From him

more than from anyone else, mostly because he more than anyone else was read in those times of darkness by men who wrote treatises and by men who did not write, the mediæval beliefs in purgatory came. The Orthodox Church of the East frankly denies that there is such a state as the Roman purgatory ; in this, as in so many cases, the 'unchanging' East condemns the changing Roman West. Gregory held that no sin can be left unpunished. He meant more than is meant by the proverbial statement that every sin brings its own penalty. 'God,' he said, 'never spares the offender, in that He never leaves a fault without taking vengeance on it. Either man by penance punishes it in himself, or God assists man to punish it.' Good works are a compensation, a balance, for sins, so he held. In themselves, he agreed with Augustine, they are insufficient to balance sins ; it is only when supplemented by God's mercy that they avail. Not in our tears, not in our deeds, but in the pleading of our Advocate must be our trust. And, further, penance may begin in fear, some of his phrases suggest directly that it *must* begin in fear ; but—it must end in love. It is these final touches, that only if the expiatory pleading of the Saviour be given, and only if in the course of penance we pass from fearing God to loving God, which redeem the theory from the charge of being one of mere mechanical equivalents—penances, and penitential thought and action, an equivalent for sin.

Some, at least, of those whom he taught were naturally anxious to know when they had done enough. In June 597, Gregory wrote to the chamberwoman of one of the imperial princesses, who had written to accuse herself of a multitude of sins, and to entreat him to tell her that the forgiveness of her sins had been revealed to him. To the first part of her letter he replied by dwelling upon the life of the Magdalene. To the latter part he replied that her request was difficult and useless : difficult because he was not worthy of a revelation ; and useless because she ought never to feel secure about her sins, never cease to weep for them till the very last day of her life, and then only because she would be too ill to make lamentation. She

must never feel a hope so definite as to make her negligent. Security is the mother of negligence. She must fear, all her life.

Then came the further question, what happens when one who is pursuing the right course of valid penance dies before it is completed? Gregory maintained that after death there would in that case be purgatorial pains which would thus adequately supplement the inadequate earthly penances. This was his contribution to the doctrine of purgatory. And he was, so far as we know, the first of the Fathers who declared the doctrine of purgatory to be necessary: that is, one that ought to be believed. Origen had held that at the Judgement all men would be subject to a fiery trial, all the saints, the Virgin Mary, all without exception. Augustine mentioned tentatively an opinion that there may be purgatorial cleansing in an intermediate state before the Judgement. It was this opinion that Gregory developed, and declared to be necessary to right belief. Those who had completed penance before death are taken straight to heaven and enjoy the vision of God even before the Judgement. Those on whose soul remains unremoved the burden of only small sins are placed in purgatory to be cleansed before the Judgement. All others are cast at once into hell. Such was the definite declaration of Gregory. On it, of course, was based the mediæval doctrine of purgatory, which, with its corollaries, developed in the very darkest ages, played a large part in the Reformation. It is not necessary to point out that the costly purgatorial Masses, for which the heirs of deceased persons had to pay, quite disregarded the limitation of Gregory to only small sins. Vast sums of money were given, and great institutions were founded, for the relief of souls of whom Gregory would have said that they had gone down at once into hell, and there they were beyond the reach of human intercession and human appeal.

Again, it cannot be questioned that Gregory firmly believed in the efficacy of Eucharistic Sacrifice, brought to bear upon souls in purgatorial fire for small sins. By small sins, he explains that he means such things as idle talking,

immoderate laughter, faults in business such as even good men could scarcely avoid, errors of ignorance in matters of small importance. Such things the Eucharistic Sacrifice could relieve from purgatorial punishment. But Gregory, like other men who lay down the law of God's procedure with such detailed dogmatism, is very puzzling when we try to grasp him. For instance, he is at least as clear as Augustine was that in order to receive the benefits of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, those who receive the benefit must have contributed their share. In offering the Sacrifice, he says, we must offer ourselves as a sacrifice, in penitence of heart. When we have made ourselves a sacrifice, then it will be truly a sacrifice to God for us. To put his declarations into a short formula, they come to this, that the Sacrifice of Christ is only efficacious for those who participate in it by sacrificing themselves. How, after that, he can dogmatically assert that the sacrifice in the Eucharist avails those who do not even participate in it, to say nothing of making themselves a sacrifice, it is difficult to see. And at least it is difficult to see how Gregory knew that it is so.

But there is another serious discrepancy. He himself gives us a case where the Eucharistic Sacrifice brought out of purgatory, in thirty days, one whose sin was so serious that he had no right to be there at all. Purgatory was much too good a place for him; his was not one of the small sins. The monk Justus, one of Gregory's own monks, who had been accustomed to minister medically to Gregory in his frequent illnesses, found himself to be dying. He confessed to his own brother Copiosus that he had broken his vow of poverty; he had three golden crowns hid in his medicine chest. Gregory was horrified to hear of this great sin. He ordered that no one of the monks should attend the deathbed of Justus, or say to him a word of comfort. When, in accordance with custom, Justus should ask for the brethren to come that he might bid them farewell, Copiosus was to tell him that all the monks detested him for his sin. Gregory explained that his purpose was to give him by this cruel means such sorrow in the hour of death as might cleanse his heart from the sin—a remarkable statement.

His body was to be buried in a dunghill ; the three crowns were to be thrown upon it ; all the monks were to cry ' Thy money perish with thee ! '—then they were to cover him up and leave him. Justus died in great agony of mind, and was buried as ordered.

Thirty days after his death, Gregory sent for his Prior, Pretiosus, and told him that as Justus had now for some time been in fiery torment, they ought to shew him some charity and try to procure his deliverance. For the next thirty days they must offer the Sacrifice for him, so that no day pass on which the Saving Victim be not offered for his forgiveness. The Prior carried out these instructions ; and Gregory, full of business, forgot all about it ; he tells us so himself. One day Copiosus came running to him, and said that he had seen a vision. Justus had appeared to him and had said ' Hitherto I have been in sore case, but now it is well with me, for to-day I receive communion.' They counted the days and found that this had occurred on the thirtieth day of the Sacrifice. ' It was thus clearly evident,' Gregory remarks, ' that the deceased was delivered from his punishment by means of the Saving Oblation.' It is not either modern scepticism or protestant obstinacy that makes a man rather resent having saving dogma made for him on such grounds, on such evidence, or by such minds.

Great differences of opinion as to the intermediate state are inevitable, and are allowable. The objection is that these curious views of Gregory were declared by him to be such as ought to be believed : that is, as necessary. The question to which the deacon about to be ordained priest answers with us is, ' Are you determined . . . to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture ? ' Here again there seem to be inconsistencies in Gregory's teaching. Set, for example, side by side these two statements. ' Holy Church, being trained in the school of humility, does not enjoin by absolute authority the right instruction she delivers, but requires faith on rational grounds of conviction.' That is one : turn now to the other :—' It is with the Church a principle that ignorance



with humility is to be preferred to knowledge accompanied by pride. Therefore she requires of her sons that they should accept her dogmas with unquestioning faith.'

One more doctrinal question may be considered, with necessary brevity: the doctrine of Saints and their present position. It has already been remarked that by Origen all were believed to need a cleansing as by fire; and that cleansing was to come at the Judgement day. But, meanwhile, it cannot be doubted that Ambrose and Jerome and Augustine, the three Latin Doctors who waited for Gregory to make the fourth, held that the Saints were patrons, advocates, intercessors with God for the living, and could interpose in their career by miracle. Gregory, taking, as his way was, his predecessors' views, treated this as an established principle of Christianity. At the same time we cannot find that he anywhere treats the invocation of Saints as a necessary part of a Christian's duty, or that their assistance is in his judgement in any sense indispensable for salvation. The Council of Trent, which on paper swept away so many mediæval abuses and excrescences, was careful on this point. While condemning all who denied the efficacy of the intervention of Saints, its utmost positive declaration was that it is 'good and useful' suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, and help.

There is a curious absence of statement in Gregory's writings about the Virgin Mary. He emphasizes the sinfulness of all human beings, even the holiest, with the single exception of Christ Himself; whereas St. Augustine, followed by the Council of Trent, held that the Blessed Virgin was without actual sin. He nowhere enjoins any special veneration of her; and indeed the Council of Trent speaks of 'the Virgin Mother of God and the other Saints,' not in that phrase making distinction. It is a remarkable fact that when our own Wilfrith was taken dangerously ill on his way from Rome just a hundred years after Gregory's death, the Archangel Michael appeared to him in a vision and pointed out to him that he had built churches in honour of St. Peter and St. Andrew, but had built none in honour



of the holy Mary, ever Virgin ; he must live to rectify that omission. Gregory only once in all his endless stories of visions and miracles mentions a prayer to the Virgin. On that occasion it was a bishop who prayed, and the Virgin's answer was a miraculous gift of twelve gold solidi, as bright as if they had just come from the mint. That is not very persuasive evidence of the efficacy of prayer to the Blessed Virgin, but to Gregory's mind it was all-sufficient. Putting it at its very strongest, Gregory's view is separated from that of the changed and changeful Roman West by a gulf over which no bridge is to be seen. Pope Leo XIII. declared that 'men hope everything from Mary,' that 'as no man goeth to the Father but by the Son, so almost no man goeth to Christ but by His mother.' In a later utterance Pope Leo also declared that men may as well try to fly without wings as to reach God without her. Of the Immaculate Conception Gregory of course says nothing, and Trent of course declares nothing. The perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Gregory of course maintains.

It became the custom in later times to regard Gregory as writing under a special inspiration, and the dove upon his shoulder became his conventional attribute in sculpture. But it may be doubted whether his claim to greatness—and great he undoubtedly was—does not rest more securely upon his character as a man of action than as a speculative thinker and theological writer. We have perforce omitted many sides of his multifarious activities indicated at the beginning of this article, and these would of course have to be taken into account in any attempt to determine the precise extent of his influence upon the world's history. He was, it has been said, 'the most able man of his time and one of the best-intentioned'; and if it seems that our study of one side of Gregory's character—and that not the least important at the present day in view of many misconceptions as to the age in which he lived—has brought out the limitation of his outlook rather than its breadth, his weakness rather than his strength, we must not be thought to forget that it was Gregory who made the Papacy the

chief power in Italy, not in spiritual matters only, but also in temporal, nor, on the other hand, those other qualities which made him appear, as Dr. Bright used to call him, the most loveable of Roman bishops.

### ART. III.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, I.

1. *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Art. *Timothy and Titus (Epistles)*. By J. MOFFATT. (London : A. & C. Black.)
2. *Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Die Pastoral-briefe*. Von Baron H. VON SODEN. (Freiburg, 1891.)
3. *The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles*. By J. D. JAMES, B.D. (London : Longmans, Green & Co., 1906.)
4. *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. By S. DAVIDSON, D.D. (London : Longmans, 1868.)
5. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Being Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, translated, revised, and enlarged by J. H. THAYER. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1886.)
6. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. By A. JÜLICHER. Translated by J. P. WARD. (London : Smith, Elder & Co., 1904.)
7. *The Authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles*. A Paper read at the Church Congress, Liverpool, October 1904. 'Church Congress Reports.' (London : Bemrose, 1904.)

THERE seems to be a very general impression, even in quarters where it might least be expected, that, whatever may be said in defence of the other writings attributed to St. Paul, the Pastoral epistles at all events have been proved to be spurious. Yet among the critics who are supposed to have established this point there is no agreement except in the assumption that they *are* spurious. Nearly a century ago now (1807) Schleiermacher questioned the authenticity of 1 Timothy, but he did so on the ground that it was a

compilation from 2 Timothy and Titus, which he let pass as genuine. Not so Eichhorn and De Wette, who denied the Pauline authorship of all three. Then came Baur,<sup>1</sup> who referred them to the period of Gnosticism, and declared that they were written after the death of Polycarp (A.D. 167). He detected in them the attempt of some orthodox controversialist to bring the authority of St. Paul to bear against the heresies of Marcion and Valentinus. This view is interesting as shewing incidentally how in religious polemics, as in other matters, honesty is, after all, the best policy. Tertullian used the Pastoral epistles as a weapon of offence against the philosophical heretics of his own day.<sup>2</sup> In particular in the 'endless genealogies' mentioned by St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 4, Tit. iii. 9) he saw a reference to the Valentinian procession of Æons.<sup>3</sup> But, as Valentinus lived in the next century, Tertullian ascribes his condemnation by St. Paul to prophetic insight on the part of the Apostle.<sup>4</sup> This anxiety on the part of a Father of the Church to wrest the words of St. Paul against his own opponents brought about the curious nemesis that Baur, so many centuries afterwards, ran away with the idea that these words were forgeries directed against those very opponents.

No one now holds Baur's view, so that it will not be necessary to combat it. The destructive critics of the present day put the supposed date of the Pastoral epistles much nearer to St. Paul's own lifetime. Let us select, as

<sup>1</sup> *Die sogenannten Pastoral-Briefe des Apostel Paulus aufs neue kritisch untersucht*, 1835.

<sup>2</sup> *De Praesc. Haeret.* 7. 'Ipsae denique haereses a philosophia subornantur. . . . Hinc illae fabulae et genealogiae interminabiles et quaestiones infructuosae et sermones serpentes velut cancer, a quibus nos apostolus refrenans nominatim philosophiam contestatur caveri oportere, scribens ad Colossenses (sc. ii. 8).'

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 33. 'Sed et cum genealogias indeterminatas nominat, Valentinus agnoscitur.'

<sup>4</sup> *Tert. adv. Valent.* 3. 'Si statim inveniat tot nomina Aeonum. . . . dubitabitne ibidem pronuntiare has esse fabulas et genealogias indeterminatas, quas apostoli spiritus, his jam tunc pullulantibus seminibus haereticis, damnare praevenit?'

representative of the rest, two impugnors of the authenticity of these letters, one in our own country and one in Germany.

The Rev. James Moffatt, writing in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, is ready to allow that the Pastoral epistles contain passages 'which have high claims to be considered as directly due to the apostle whose name the letters bear,' but on the whole he regards the conclusion as 'one of the best established in New Testament research—that the three epistles are pseudonymous, composed by a Paulinist in Asia Minor not earlier than the close of the first century, and not later than the second decade of the second century.' There are, according to the same writer, three stages to be distinguished in their composition :

- (i) The primitive notes from Paul's lifetime.
- (ii) The incorporation of these by the author about forty years after Paul's death.
- (iii) Glosses added in the second century.

According to Baron von Soden,<sup>1</sup> 2 Timothy, which he regards as the first-written of the three epistles, may be dated along with Ephesians and Luke—Acts, while 1 Timothy and Titus fall at the earliest into the first decade of the second century. He considers the author to have been a Greek, not a Jew, and holds that the place from which they were written was Rome.

Both writers seem to agree in condoning the imposition which, according to them, was practised at so early a period upon the Church. Here are the words which Mr. Moffatt uses on this subject :

'The prevailing deference shown to the apostles and to Paul by contemporary and later writers who disclaim all pretensions to equality with them, as well as the fact that mere literary ambition was utterly foreign to the early Christian consciousness at this period, may serve to guarantee the ethical honour of the pastorals and to corroborate the impression left by themselves that their author was right in feeling himself not merely justified but obliged to sanction and support his message by his master's name.' (Vol. iv. cc. 5095-6).

Now this, we submit, is great nonsense. Nor can we

<sup>1</sup> *Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.*

accept Von Soden's verdict that the inclusion of these letters in the Canon was still fully justified. Let us have a clear issue. Either these letters are the genuine outpouring of St. Paul's heart to his most familiar and most trusted disciples, or a fraud which ought never to have been included in the Canon.

The evidence by which this question has to be settled divides itself, as usual, into external and internal. The external is well set forth in the first chapter of a recent book by the Rev. J. D. James, B.D. We shall deal here only with the internal.

The internal evidence falls under three heads :

- (1) The historical situation.
- (2) The nature of the subject-matter.
- (3) The language and style.

#### I. THE HISTORICAL SITUATION.

In the life of St. Paul as known to us from other sources there is no room, it is contended, for the historical situation depicted in the Pastoral epistles. This contention is just.

It is impossible to fit these letters into the life of the Apostle as recorded in the Acts. But then the whole life is not there recorded. The narrative in Acts breaks off abruptly after telling us that Paul spent two whole years at Rome in the active exercise of his ministry. What befell him after that we do not know, except in so far as these epistles themselves reveal it. From them we seem to gather that after his release from the custody of the centurion (Acts xxviii. 16, 30) St. Paul visited the following places : Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20) Crete (Tit. i. 5), Ephesus, Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13). We give the names in alphabetical order, because the order in time is mostly conjectural. On quitting Ephesus for Macedonia, St. Paul left Timothy there to guard the faith against would-be teachers of the law (1 Tim. i. 3-7). While Timothy is in this position St. Paul writes to him, hoping to come to him shortly, but meantime giving him instructions, in case his own return should be delayed, in order that Timothy might know 'how men ought to behave

themselves in the house of God' (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15). This is the first of the three Pastoral epistles.

The third is the Epistle to Titus, who had been left in Crete in a position analogous to that of Timothy at Ephesus (Tit. i. 5). It is very like the First Epistle to Timothy, containing warnings against false teachers, 'specially they of the circumcision' (Tit. i. 10), and directions for church government. When writing it, St. Paul was looking forward to spending the winter at Nicopolis (probably the well-known city of that name in Epirus), and instructs Titus to join him there, whenever he should send to him Artemas or Tychicus (Tit. iii. 12). Zenas the lawyer and Apollos may possibly have been the bearers of this letter; at all events Titus is exhorted to 'set them forward on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them' (Tit. iii. 13).

The Second Epistle to Timothy is more of a letter than of a set epistle. It is full of personal exhortation and contains, like the rest, warnings against false teaching, but no directions for church organization, so that it is not in a strict sense a Pastoral. Timothy appears from it to be still at Ephesus,<sup>1</sup> but St. Paul earnestly summons him to his side, as he has a prevision of approaching martyrdom (iv. 6-8). His own strength is spent, and he wishes to hand on the torch to one who is still fresh for the course. The Apostle, when writing, is again a prisoner (i. 8, ii. 9), and everything goes to shew (i. 16, 17; iv. 21) that he is at Rome.

Such, in brief outline, is the historical situation presented in the Pastoral epistles. Is there anything in it which is the least improbable, or in any way calculated to arouse a suspicion of forgery? The fact that it lies outside the life of St. Paul as recorded in the Acts is in no way against it, or rather may be regarded as telling in its favour; for

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. i. 15-18, ii. 18, iv. 14, compared with Acts xix. 33, iv. 19; Acts xviii. 18, 19, 24, 26. The words in 2 Tim. iv. 12, 'But Tychicus I sent to Ephesus,' might be thought to tell against this; but the aorist there is probably epistolary—'But Tychicus I am sending to Ephesus,' he being the bearer of the letter.

a forger would have been likely to give verisimilitude to fictitious letters by trying to make them agree with known records. The Anti-Pastoralians, if one may be allowed to coin such a term, have to make up their minds as to this point, whether the situation which has just been described is real or imaginary. If they think it real, and this is apparently what Mr. Moffatt thinks, since he regards these epistles as based on 'primitive notes from Paul's lifetime,' then we do not lose the interesting chapter in St. Paul's life which the Pastorals open up to us. But if they think it imaginary, then we have to do with no ordinary forger, but with a person of consummate literary skill, who, without a word of direct statement, but by means of casual references dropped in the most easy and natural way, has conjured up for the world's belief out of his own inventive brain this continuation of the life of St. Paul after the close of the real records. Defoe or one of the great masters of fiction might have performed this prodigy; but those who do not believe in prodigies, except on compulsion, will take refuge in the simple hypothesis that the reputed author of these letters is also the real one.

Since the narrative of Acts stops at the first imprisonment, and St. Paul's letters also fail us, if the Pastorals be disallowed, it is difficult to discuss the historical situation except by inviting the critics to shew what internal discrepancies it contains. There is, however, one other resource open to us. A man's intentions are not always a safe guide to his actions. They may be overruled by circumstances or abandoned from levity. The latter is not likely in St. Paul's case, but the former is a thing from which no one can escape. Let us ask, therefore, what intentions with regard to the future St. Paul expresses in his other letters. First of all, in Romans xv. 24, 28 we find him hoping to visit Rome on his way to Spain. Next, in writing from Rome to the Philippians (ii. 24), he confidently anticipates that he will soon come to them in person. Lastly, in Philemon 22 he bids Philemon prepare to receive him at Colossae. The very different way in which he actually reached Rome from that which he had at first anticipated,



and the long time he was detained there, may have upset his plan of going on to Spain. At all events, in his letters from Rome he is not looking westwards but eastwards—towards Philippi and Colossae, as we have just seen. It is difficult then to believe that he really went to Spain, though this belief seems certainly to have been held by St. Clement, when he speaks of the Apostle 'having gone to the sunset's bound' (Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. v. 7), and is confirmed by the obscure reference to the subject in the Muratorian fragment. But supposing Paul, on being released from Rome, to have hurried off to Philippi and Colossae, then he could hardly have avoided taking on his way from one to the other some of the places mentioned in the Pastorals, to wit the Troad, Ephesus, and Miletus. But we are told by Von Soden that the author of Acts excludes the supposition of a second imprisonment: and the evidence offered for this is Acts xx. 24-28 and xxiii. 11. The latter passage does not seem to prove anything except that St. Paul had a premonition that he was to preach at Rome. With regard to the former, we have two alternatives. Either the speech to the elders at Miletus was really made by St. Paul in some such terms as we have it in the Acts, and was reported by a travelling companion, or else it was invented by the writer. It is only the latter alternative which excludes the supposition of a second imprisonment, or rather of a second visit to Ephesus. When St. Paul addressed the elders of Ephesus, he was firmly convinced that they would see his face no more (Acts xx. 25, 38); but which is the more likely, that this impression was falsified by the result, or that a forger, wishing to pass for St. Paul, would invent the falsification of it? The latter supposition is surely destitute of all plausibility. If, in view of this difficulty, it should be maintained that the revisiting of Ephesus is part of 'the primitive notes from Paul's lifetime,' then it is conceded that the situation is so far historical: which would make it likely that the letters which depict it are so also.

Everything seems to shew that 2 Timothy was written later than 1 Timothy, and was in fact the last letter that

St. Paul ever wrote, so far, at least, as we can know. Von Soden, however, considers that 1 Timothy was written by his supposed 'Paulinist' *after* 2 Timothy. His reason for this view is interesting. It is that in 1 Tim. i. 20 Hymenæus is delivered unto Satan, which Von Soden thinks would prevent his playing the part assigned to him in 2 Tim. ii. 17-20. Now what precisely does the critic mean by this? If he were an old-fashioned believer, we might remind him that people have often played as active a part after an ecclesiastical fulmination as before. But this interpretation would make him assume the genuineness of the letters in order to prove their spuriousness. He must, therefore, mean that it would not seem proper to the pseudonymous author to let Hymenæus continue his career after he had been struck by St. Paul's thunderbolt. This is likely enough, if there ever were such a pseudonymous author, but, as on the contrary supposition, everything points to the traditional order of the letters being also the real one, we are driven to conclude that the thunderbolt was launched indeed, but without visible effect. And this, we venture to think, is a presumption in favour of the genuineness of these letters.

So long as the heretics combated by the author of the Pastorals were supposed to be the Valentinians and Marcionites, and the historical situation in this respect to be that of the latter half of the second century, there was a real question to be discussed under this head; but, now that the difference in time has been reduced to a matter of forty years, it is difficult for those who lack the fine historical sense of the Anti-Pastoralians to know what to say on this subject at all. Let us, however, collect the notices of these heretics and then consider whether there is anything in them inconsistent with the supposition that the persons denounced were contemporary with the close of St. Paul's career.

It is evident, in the first place, that these persons were mostly Jews. They are spoken of as 'would-be teachers of the law' (1 Tim. i. 7); and the worst of them are described as 'they of the circumcision' (Tit. i. 10); more-

over their doctrines are referred to as 'Jewish fables' (Tit. i. 14) and as 'fightings about the law' (Tit. iii. 9). They are also described as ascetic in their tendencies, forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats (1 Tim. iv. 3), as ignorant and contentious (1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 23), hypocritical, and lying (1 Tim. iv. 2), subverters of households (Tit. i. 11), who lead captive silly women (2 Tim. iii. 6), and are animated by a desire for base gain (1 Tim. vi. 5; Tit. i. 11). As for their doctrines, these, as we have seen, are set down as 'fables' (1 Tim. i. 4; iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14), as 'endless genealogies' (1 Tim. i. 4; cf. Tit. iii. 9), and generally as vain wranglings. In particular some of them declared that the resurrection had already taken place (2 Tim. ii. 18). In this connexion the names of Hymenæus and Philetus are mentioned. In 1 Tim. i. 20 Alexander is mentioned along with Hymenæus as having been 'delivered unto Satan.' In 2 Tim. i. 15 the names of Phygelus and Hermogenes are coupled with the Apostle's sweeping assertion that all that are in Asia turned away from him.

We envy the keen discernment of the critic who is able to declare that this situation is not that of St. Paul's own time, but of forty years later. For our own part we fail to distinguish it from the general situation presented by the Pauline epistles. Let us begin with the fact that the opponents were mostly Jews. Is it necessary to remind the reader *who* were the life-long antagonists of St. Paul, who had him scourged five times, who so often tried to murder him, and who wrung from him his most bitter utterances? (2 Cor. xi. 24; 1 Thess. ii. 15; Gal. v. 12).

As to the mixture of asceticism with Judaism, that is a phenomenon which frequently presents itself. We have no reason to suppose that it was more rife at the beginning of the second century than at the close of the first. It seems to have been due in part to a desire to avoid ceremonial impurity, as in the case of Daniel (i. 10) and Tobit (i. 10, 11), but this is not by itself a sufficient account of the matter. Bishop Lightfoot thought that it indicated a Gnostic belief in the essentially evil nature of matter.

Be this as it may, we find the principles of monasticism among the Jews prior to Christianity. The Essenes for the most part were celibates. The Therapeutæ are described by Philo (II. 477, *Vit. Cont.* § 4) as living on cheap bread with salt for their only condiment, or, as a great luxury, hyssop, while their drink was water from the spring. None of them would touch food or drink before nightfall; some only partook of nourishment every third day; a few even succeeded in feeding only on one day of the week, not counting the sabbath, which was devoted to rest and refreshment after their toils in study. Josephus (*Vit.* § 3) mentions some Jewish priests, friends of his own, who were sent to Rome by Felix on some trifling charge, and who, 'though in evil plight, forgot not their piety towards the Deity, but fed on figs and nuts.' Abstention from wine and strong drink was always part of the Jewish ideal of sanctity. We see this in the vow of the Nazarite, and in the instances of Samson, Samuel, John the Baptist, and James the Just as described by Hegesippus (*Eus. H. E.* II. 23): 'He drank no wine or strong drink, neither ate he of that which hath life. A razor did not pass upon his head, he anointed not himself with oil, and the bath he did not use.' The reference in Romans xiv. 2 to the weaker brethren, who ate only herbs, shews that this tendency to asceticism was already in Paul's time invading Christianity; and it appears also in what is called 'the Colossian heresy' with its 'Handle not, nor taste, nor touch' (*Col.* ii. 21).

As to the charges of ignorance and moral depravity brought against his opponents by the writer of the Pastorals, it will hardly be contended that that is a feature more characteristic of one decade than of another. Certainly there is nothing inconsistent with St. Paul's authorship. His mind had the defect of its qualities. Zeal and intensity do not mate with tolerance. Those who opposed him were 'false apostles' and 'false brethren' (*2 Cor.* xi. 13, 26). We may regret that this should have been so, but ought to recognize that, had it been otherwise, he might never have done his work in the world, which is not moved by pure

reason but by passionate zeal. It was not Erasmus but Luther who accomplished the Reformation.

As to the doctrines of the Jewish teachers whom St. Paul combats being characterized as 'fables,' no one will deny to the ancient Jews the possession of a vivid imagination; but who will say that this faculty is more likely to have been at work after the Apostle's death than during his lifetime? As to the 'endless genealogies,' a plausible, if unsatisfactory, account of these was furnished by Baur's theory, which referred them to the Valentinian procession of Æons. But no light is thrown upon them by the supposition which now holds the field, of a date forty years after St. Paul's death. It is likely enough that the Jewish members of the Christian Church were already at work during St. Paul's lifetime on those attempts to trace the genealogy of Jesus, of which we see the results in the early chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and which have certainly tended to 'questionings' rather than to 'edification.' It was part of St. Paul's gospel (2 Tim. ii. 8), indeed, that Jesus was 'according to the flesh' of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3), but it was 'the spirit of holiness' which 'by the resurrection from the dead' marked him off as 'the Son of God with power.' We may, therefore, well believe that St. Paul would discourage similar attempts to glorify his Master in a way so different from that adopted by himself, a way which he would regard as savouring of the flesh as against the spirit.

The idea that the resurrection had already taken place, if it is to be explained by language used of baptism, would be a doctrine of an opposite tendency to that which has just been spoken of, but even more repugnant to the mind of St. Paul, who frankly confesses that without the resurrection those who had put their hope in Christ would be 'of all men most miserable' (1 Cor. xv. 19). The members of the Corinthian Church who said that there was no resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. xv. 12) may have been holding the doctrine which is condemned in Hymenæus and Philetus, one which St. Paul might naturally enough represent as a denial of the resurrection altogether. But with regard to subjects

of which we know so little, it is perhaps wiser to confess ignorance than to reason on uncertain data. This much, however, may fearlessly be asserted: that, if in St. Paul's lifetime the resurrection could be denied by professing Christians, it might also be declared to be a thing already past. The latter is on the face of it more probable than the former; but yet we know the former to have been the case.

On the whole, then, it would seem that there is nothing in the notices of the heretics which can be collected from the Pastorals to suggest that these teachers were later than St. Paul's lifetime.

This closes what we have to say under our first head of internal evidence, which deals with the historical situation, and we pass on now to the second: namely, the nature of the subject-matter. But the reader must not expect a scientific frontier between our different divisions. Indeed, a great deal that we shall have to say under the second head might quite as well have found a place under the first.

## 2. THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT-MATTER.

The interests of the Pastorals, we are told by Von Soden, are not those of St. Paul—there is no anti-Judaism and there is too much stress laid on church organization. This is not a very damaging indictment. For the eschatological interests of the Thessalonians are not the same as the anti-Judaic interests of the letters written during the third missionary journey, while again fresh interests come uppermost in the Christology of the epistles written from Rome during the first imprisonment. St. Paul's was a living and moving mind, which did not always harp on the same string. Nothing is more natural than that at the end of his career his supreme interest should be in the preservation of the churches which he had spent his life in establishing.

But the organization of these churches, it is maintained, as presented in the Pastorals, is too advanced for St. Paul's time, and argues a later date. But what grounds are there for this assertion? The organization is of the

simplest kind possible. There are evidently only two orders in the church—bishops or elders and deacons. This exactly tallies with what we are able to collect from other sources with regard to church organization in the Apostle's lifetime. The epistle to the Philippians begins with greetings 'to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with *bishops and deacons*.' In Acts xx. the 'elders' (v. 17) of Ephesus are spoken of in St. Paul's address as 'bishops' (v. 28). If the reader will compare verse 5 with verse 7 of the first chapter of Titus, he will find it difficult to deny that there also the terms 'elder' and 'bishop' are used interchangeably. There is no warrant for the assertion, which has been repeated since Baur, that in the Pastorals the bishop already enjoys a kind of primacy among his peers, as though he were a Moderator of the General Assembly. The fancied evidence for this inference is the use of the singular 'the bishop' (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7), but this use of the singular with the definite article is generic, as in English. If for '*the* bishop' we substitute '*an* overseer,' we shall less ambiguously represent the force of the original. In St. Paul's time, as the organization of the Church was rudimentary, so the language which reflected it was still fluid. 'The elders,' as St. Chrysostom observes, 'were in old times called bishops and deacons of Christ, and the bishops elders.' As the term 'deacon' means simply 'minister,' it is naturally one of wide extent. St. Paul applies it to the political ruler, of whom he tells the quiet well-doer—'He is a minister of God to thee for good.' He applies it to himself as a minister of the Church (Col. i. 25), and to Timothy as a minister of Christ Jesus (1 Tim. iv. 6). But in 1 Tim. iii. 8, as in Phil. i. 1, it is no longer used in a general but in a special sense, of church functionaries of a lower rank than the elders or bishops. Of the first institution of some such functionaries in the Church at Jerusalem, which would set the example to the rest, we have an account in Acts vi. 1-6. The original motive for this step was to relieve the Apostles from temporal cares, and leave them free to devote themselves to the ministry of the word instead of being obliged



to minister to tables. The term 'deacons,' it is true, is not actually used of Stephen and his associates, but we can hardly go wrong in accepting the traditional view that it was the needs of the daily ministration (Acts vi. 1) which first gave rise to the diaconate.

But if the origin of the third order of the Church may thus be traced, that of the second is lost in the mists of antiquity. Government by elders was common to the Semitic peoples, and doubtless goes back to patriarchal times. It was simply taken over by the Christians from the Jews. The presbytery or body of elders mentioned in Luke xxii. 66 and in Acts xxii. 5 was Jewish; that mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 14 as having ordained Timothy was evidently Christian. Jewish elders at Jerusalem figure largely in the first three Gospels, though they nowhere appear in the Fourth, except in the inserted story of the woman taken in adultery; and in Luke vii. 3 we have mention of local elders as being sent by the centurion at Capernaum to Jesus. So essential, indeed, are elders to the Jewish mind that we find the institution translated to heaven by the seer of the Apocalypse. Accordingly elders appear as a matter of course in the organization of the early Christian churches. We have no account of their institution in the mother-church at Jerusalem, as we have of that of deacons, but we find them there from the first, ranking next after the Apostles (Acts xi. 30; xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; xvi. 4; xxi. 18). The first thing that St. Paul did when he founded a new church was to appoint elders there (Acts xiv. 23), who, as their function was to 'watch over' the young community, might equally be called 'bishops.' The same thing had been done in the churches of the Jewish dispersion addressed in 1 Peter, and the writer of that letter expresses the office of these *πρεσβύτεροι* by the verb *ἐπισκοπεῖν* (1 Peter v. 1, 2). Similarly in 1 Clem. *ad Cor.* xlv. 4 the abstract term *ἐπισκοπή* is used of the office of the *πρεσβύτεροι*. The same men who were called *πρεσβύτεροι*, to indicate their dignity, were called, in relation to their work, *ἐπίσκοποι*, the latter being a common Greek word meaning superintendents or overseers of any kind. It might

be applied to a foreman of works or to an Inspector-General sent by Athens to a subject-state (Aristoph. *Av.* 1022). The word occurs fifteen times in the Septuagint, where it varies in its application from God to an overseer of labour. It was after the time of the Pastorals that the word *ἐπίσκοπος*, after being interchangeable with *πρεσβύτερος*, became differentiated from it, so as to denote the monarchical bishop, or first order of the Christian hierarchy, which seems to have become a practical necessity in the sub-apostolic age. If any analogue at all to the later 'bishop' is to be found in these early times, it is in the primacy allowed to James at Jerusalem, as 'the Lord's brother,' and in the position held by Timothy and Titus as delegates of the apostolical commission claimed by St. Paul.

The progress from the diaconate to the presbyterate implied in 1 Tim. iii. 13 has also been noted as characteristic of the second century. That we may cheerfully grant, if we are allowed to add that it was handed on to the second century from the first. As we know that there were bishops and deacons in the Pauline churches (Phil. i. 1), nothing can be more natural than to suppose that the proper performance of the duties of the lower position constituted a claim to promotion to the higher. The deacons themselves were to be tested before being permanently appointed to their posts (1 Tim. iii. 10). This is a measure of common sense which might commend itself in any age.

In between the directions given about deacons in 1 Tim. iii. 8-13 there is a sudden injunction about women in verse 11, that they must be 'grave, not slanderous, temperate, faithful in all things.' This seems at first out of place, especially as the behaviour of women has already been dealt with in ii. 9-15. But if there were female deacons, the seeming irrelevance of the remark would disappear. Now that this was the case we gather from the casual mention of Phoebe in Rom. xvi. 1 as a deaconess of the church at Cenchreae.

Again, the rule that a bishop is to be the husband of one wife (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 6) is declared to be characteristic of the second century; and it is quite true that

at that period second marriage was discountenanced, as being merely 'a specious adultery.' Some trace of this feeling is to be found even among Pagan authors as early as the close of the first century (A.D. 98), if we may judge from Tacitus' eulogy on some of the German tribes, among whom there was no marriage but with maidens (Tac. *Germ.* 19). But the enjoining of marriage on the younger widows is quite contrary to the feeling of the second century, and quite consonant with what we know of the views of St. Paul, who, although he held that the perfect course was to remain single (1 Cor. vii. 8), yet felt that this advice was not good for everybody. In Rom. vii. 3 and 1 Cor. vii. 39, he recognizes the lawfulness of second marriage on the part of a widow. From this it is a natural step to enjoining it in preference to turning aside after Satan (1 Tim. v. 15).

But we are told that the word *χήρα* in this context does not necessarily mean a widow, but is used, as in the second century, to denote a consecrated life. In illustration of this meaning we are referred to the close of Ignatius' Epistle to the Smyrnæans, where he sends his greetings to 'the virgins that are called widows.' The reason by which this proposition is supported is worse than the proposition itself. The word *χῆραι*, it was argued by Baur, cannot here mean 'widows,' else St. Paul, in advising the younger of them to marry, would, in accordance with his own rule laid down in 1 Tim. v. 10, be excluding them from the Church's bounty. Doubtless he would, but then, if married again, they would not require it; to be a pensioner is only desirable as a *pis-aller*.

In the passage in the Pastorals (1 Tim. v. 3-16) there is nothing to suggest that the word 'widows' means anything but women who have lost their husbands by death. Still it would be nothing surprising if in St. Paul's time, as in that of St. Ignatius, the word *χήρα* might be extended on occasion to unmarried females who were destitute of support. What became of the old maids of Palestine? In polygamous times perhaps there were none; we cannot recall one in the Old Testament. But in the time of Christ polygamy, if still allowed, was hardly practised, and there

must then have been women who failed to obtain husbands. These, if left destitute in old age, may have been allowed to share in the provision made for widows. The care of widows and orphans is among the most honourable characteristics of the Jews, and, like other things, it was taken over from them by Christianity. In this fact, not in the late date of the Pastorals, lies the explanation of the systematic arrangements which we find in these writings with regard to destitute widows. The care of widows occupied the Church from its infancy. It was this which led to the institution of deacons, when the Hellenist Jews found that their widows were being neglected in the daily ministration (Acts vi. 1). In the Acts also, as well as in the Pastorals, the widows seem to constitute a kind of religious order in themselves. They are to the fore at Joppa on the occasion of the death of Tabitha, and, when Peter restores her to life, he calls 'the saints and widows' (Acts ix. 39, 41). St. James again (i. 27) makes the care of widows and orphans to be one half of 'essential Christianity.' The same feeling appears very strongly in the *Pastor of Hermas* (Mand. viii. § 10; Sim. i. § 8, v. 3 § 7, ix. 26 § 2), where deacons who plunder the living of widows and orphans are denounced, and where Grapte, who has the spiritual care of them, seems to be on the same level of importance as Hermas himself, the prophet of the Church, and Clement, who has the charge of its external relations (*Vís.* ii. 4 § 3). In the 'Two Ways' also at the end of the Epistle of Barnabas we find inattention to widows and orphans among the indications of the Way of the Black One' (*Ep. Barn.* xx. § 1.)

Women who are deprived of the joys of domestic life naturally seek consolation in religion. Anna the prophetess spent her eighty-four years of widowhood in the Temple, 'worshipping with fastings and supplications night and day' (Luke ii. 37). The writer of the Pastorals takes for granted that 'she that is a widow indeed . . . continueth in supplication and prayers night and day.' The absence of 'fastings' here is just what we might expect from St. Paul. 'She that is a widow indeed' is perhaps sufficiently explained in its context (1 Tim. v. 3-16) as a widow who

is really desolate, having no children or descendants to support her, but still something of a religious connotation seems also to attach itself to the term. The conditions of being enrolled on the Church's list of widows,<sup>1</sup> besides that of being really destitute, are three, as enumerated by the author of the Pastoral epistles, namely :

- (1) That the widow must not be under sixty years of age.
- (2) That she must have been the wife of one husband.
- (3) That she must have testimony borne to her of good works.

Among the good works specified are having brought up children, having exercised hospitality to strangers, having washed the feet of the saints (*cf.* Luke vii. 38, 44 ; John xiii. 1-14), and having assisted those in affliction. There is surely here nothing inconsistent with Apostolic times or Pauline authorship. St. Paul's views as to the probable course of the world changed as he grew older. He began by telling his converts that they might expect an immediate end to the world, and when he found that misinterpretations had arisen he was obliged to modify that assertion. In his old age he came to the conclusion that, as the world seemed likely to outlast himself, the best thing he could do was to provide, to the extent of his power, for the practical needs of the growing Church, which was the task which he set himself in the Pastorals. This is surely a more reasonable way of putting the matter than to declare that St. Paul, from his intense spirituality, was indifferent to the organization of the churches which he spent his life in founding, and consequently could not have written the Pastoral epistles, which display so lively an interest in the subject.

But, we are told, the Christianity is not that of Paul. This sounds a formidable indictment, but the edge is rather taken off it by the fact that the same persons who say this maintain that the letters are written by someone who wished to avail himself of the authority of St. Paul against certain heretics of his own day. The Christianity, then, is meant for Paul's, and is the best imitation that can be

<sup>1</sup> The words *χίρα καταλεγίσθω* point to the term *κατάλογος*, which was afterwards regularly employed of the clergy-roll.

produced by an ardent disciple; but the critic is able to see through the sham. The main proof which is offered of the absence of the true Pauline standpoint lies in the use of the word 'faith.' Faith, it is contended, from being subjective has become objective; it is now *fides quæ creditur*, whereas before it was *fides qua creditur*. The passages quoted by Von Soden in support of this view are 1 Tim. i. 19, iv. 1, vi. 10, 21; Tit. i. 4. He does not find this use in 2 Timothy. Now it need not be denied that in the passages quoted by Von Soden (with the exception of Tit. i. 4), and perhaps in others which he has not quoted (1 Tim. iii. 9, iv. 6, v. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 8, iv. 7; Tit. i. 13) the term 'faith' is approaching the later sense of 'creed,' which it evidently bears in Jude, verse 3. But it is one thing to grant, or rather to maintain this, and another to allow that the writer is not St. Paul. There is a rudimentary and apparently rhythmical creed in 1 Tim. iii. 16. If the thing itself is there, what wonder that there should be a name to express it? <sup>1</sup> The truth seems to be that this externalization of 'faith' is inseparable from the process of transmission. St. Paul cannot hand on to his disciples his own inner experiences, but only the propositions in which they have resulted. The subjective faith, or warm personal trust in Christ, is certainly not absent from the man who, amid his bonds and suffering, exclaims 'I know him whom I have believed' (2 Tim. i. 12),<sup>2</sup> but the faith which can be imparted by instruction and confided as a deposit to Timothy (2 Tim. i. 12, 14; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 20), by him to be committed 'to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also' (2 Tim. ii. 2), necessarily assumes the form of a body of doctrine. Unless, then, we think that the man who anathematized himself or an angel from heaven who should preach any other gospel than that which he had preached (Gal. i. 8)

<sup>1</sup> τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως in verse 9 seems to be equivalent to τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον in verse 16, both πίστις and εὐσεβεία being used in an objective sense, the one for the creed, the other for the religion of Christianity.

<sup>2</sup> Von Soden enumerates πιστεύειν among Pauline words unused in the Pastorals, except, he says, 1 Tim. i. 16. We must add 2 Tim. i. 12, Tit. iii. 8.



was not anxious about the correct transmission of his own teaching, we ought rather to expect that the faith which Paul inculcates on his followers should be made objective in propositions as to the saving power of Christ. 'That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners' (1 Tim. i. 15)—this was the message which St. Paul was so anxious should reach the world after him, this was the charge which he committed to his child Timothy (1 Tim. i. 18). That this salvation was a free gift, not depending on our works (2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5) but on God's mercy—this is the gist of his doctrine in the Pastorals. Will anyone say that it is 'un-Pauline'? In what has just been said we have unawares been answering another count in the indictment against the Christianity of the Pastorals. Their appeal, says Von Soden, is to authority, not to direct religious experience. It is not easy to see how it could be otherwise under the circumstances. The man who derives truth from the well-spring of his own private and particular inspiration is the very man to be dogmatic in imparting it to others. But the authority appealed to is declared by Von Soden to be that of Paul's doctrine (1 Tim. iv. 6, vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 2, 8). Mr. Moffatt even accounts for the writer's omission of the Virgin Birth from his rhythmic summary by ascribing it to 'his genuinely Pauline standpoint.' 'This adherence to the older view,' he adds,<sup>1</sup> 'is all the more remarkable side by side with the eager insistence on it in *Asc. Isaiae* xi. 2-22 and Ignat. *ad Eph.* 19 (where a Pauline citation occurs, 1 Cor. ii. 8), both contemporary writings.' The omission of the Virgin Birth ceases to have anything remarkable about it if we ascribe the Pastorals to St. Paul, who nowhere directly mentions it.

If an ingenious man once starts upon a wrong scent, he goes deeper into error than a duller-witted person would do. So we would fain account for the curious idea of the same author that the use of the word *γνήσιοι* with regard to Timothy and Titus shews that the writer was anxious to establish the doctrine of Apostolical succession. If this argument be allowed weight, it ought to be applied

<sup>1</sup> *Ency. Bibl.* vol. iv. col. 5084, note 2.



also to Phil. iv. 3, where St. Paul bestows the same epithet on some one whose name he appears to be playing upon. In that case it would go to prove the genuineness of the Pastorals. But the fact is that *γνήσιος* was a term of epistolary politeness.<sup>1</sup> One might almost as well try to found an argument on the formula 'yours sincerely' in an English letter.

But we are asked, Why the necessity of Paul's dwelling on himself, if writing to familiar friends? The implication of this question is that the forger is a clumsy one, who does not understand human nature. We venture to think that, if there be a forger, he understands human nature better than the critics. For to whom is a man more likely to dwell upon himself than to those from whom he is certain of a sympathetic hearing? The wives of men's bosoms could, we think, enlighten the critics on this point. What can be more natural than the beautiful passage 1 Tim. i. 12-17 (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 9) as addressed to an affectionate and admiring disciple? And if the Apostle's parade of his own merits in 2 Tim. iii. 10 should appear in bad taste to some who have not endured his sufferings, we can only reply that ancient sentiment was not so squeamish on this point as modern. Boasting in the Lord can hardly be put down as 'un-Pauline.' As for his insistence on his claim to apostleship in quarters where it was not likely to be disputed (1 Tim. i. 11-12, ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; Tit. i. 3), it must be borne in mind that, though these letters were written to private friends, St. Paul cannot have supposed that they would reach no other eyes. Self-assertion was a necessity of his position. The *ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι* derived their commission from their Master. No one could dispute that. But from whom did St. Paul derive his? It was open to an enemy to say that he derived it from himself. He was never weary of repeating that he derived it from Christ.

Another line of objection which is urged against the genuineness of the Pastorals is this:—If St. Paul expected to

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the heading of the letter from Eleazar to Ptolemy Philadelphus given by Aristeas § 41: Ἐλεάζαρος ἀρχιερεὺς βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ φίλῳ γνήσιφ χαίρειν.

see Timothy and Titus shortly (1 Tim. iii. 14 ; 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21 ; Tit. iii. 12), why write these careful directions which might have been given by word of mouth ? To which the answer seems an easy one : namely, that though St. Paul was writing to Timothy and Titus, he at the same time meant what he said to serve as a ' pattern of sound words ' to others. But this objection seems to tell as much against the theory of forgery as that of genuineness. Many genuine letters contain inconsistencies, real or apparent ; but a deliberate impersonator would be on the watch to avoid them. A still weaker kind of argument is this : Philippians ii. 19-24 shews Paul's complete trust in Timothy : why, then, the incessant exhortations ? To this we may reply that it is just what might be expected that St. Paul should write *of* Timothy in one way and *to* him in another. *Of* him he says to the Philippians : ' For I have no man likeminded, who will care truly for your state. For they all seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ. But ye know the proof of him, that, as a child serveth a father, so he served with me in furtherance of the gospel.' Writing *to* him he evinces all the tender anxiety of a father for a son, knowing his weaknesses, and encouraging him at every turn, lest he should in any respect fall short of the high estimate that he has formed of him. And yet Baron von Soden has the hardihood to tell us that St. Paul's relations with Timothy, as depicted, are not reconcilable with authentic records. And when St. Paul says to his disciple ' Flee youthful lusts ' (2 Tim. ii. 22), this is put down as an indication of spuriousness, because Timothy must then have been between thirty and forty. People then must have been very different from what they are now, if a warning was unnecessary to a man still in his prime with regard to natural appetites. But then Von Soden does not regard Timothy and Titus as being men with passions at all, but as mere ' types of all who hold the traditional doctrine.' This, he says, even appears in the text.<sup>1</sup> We may add that the elders addressed in 1 Peter v. 3<sup>2</sup> ought, on the same shewing, to

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 12, *τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν* ; Tit. ii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου*.

be analyzed into abstractions, and so also ought the Christians of Thessalonica (1 Thess. i. 7).

On what Von Soden bases his conclusion that the author of the Pastorals was a Greek, not a Jew, it would be hard to say. There are quotations from the Old Testament in 1 Tim. v. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 19, and, what is still less likely to have come from a Greek, there is an allusion in 2 Tim. iii. 8 to a Jewish tradition which is not in the Old Testament. Besides this the argument in several places presupposes an acquaintance with Jewish Scriptures.

Now, before we close this section on the nature of the subject-matter, there are a few questions which we should like to put to the Anti-Pastoralians.

Is it likely that a forger would fabricate two documents so closely resembling one another as 1 Timothy and Titus? On the other hand, we urge, it is quite likely that St. Paul himself would write in almost the same terms to two persons in so similar a situation. Is it likely that a pseudonymous author, who wished to shield himself under the authority of St. Paul, would invent the detail that the Apostle of the Gentiles was deserted on his first defence by all the Christians at Rome (2 Tim. iv. 16)? We know this from no other source, but it chimes in well with St. Paul's own words in Phil. i. 12-18, from which it is evident that he was on strained relations with some other members of the Christian Church in that city.

Is it likely that such a writer would tell us that all in Asia turned away from St. Paul (2 Tim. i. 15)? This again we know from no other source, but it is in keeping with the hatred of St. Paul revealed in the Clementines.

Is it likely that it would enter the head of the devout impostor imagined by the critics to recommend Timothy to take a little wine for his stomach's sake (1 Tim. v. 23)?

Is it likely that the passage about the cloak and the books, not to mention other details which bear upon themselves the stamp of truth, would occur to our ethically honourable forger?

These things are so unlikely that to all our questions except the last the critics themselves answer No. They are

obliged to suppose that the passages in which these things and others like them occur are genuine fragments of Paul which our honest friend has interwoven into his patch-work. But, this being so, we have to ask in conclusion, Is it likely that an hypothesis which requires thus to be bolstered up at every turn is really the true account of the matter?

In the next article we hope to consider the arguments which are based upon considerations of language and style.

#### ART. IV.—THOMAS À KEMPIS AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE COMMON LIFE.

1. *The Founders of the New Devotion, being the Lives of Gerard Groote, Florentius Radewin, and their followers.* By THOMAS À KEMPIS. Translated into English by J. P. ARTHUR. (London: Kegan Paul, 1905.)
2. *The Chronicle of the Canons Regular of Mount St. Agnes.* Written by THOMAS À KEMPIS. Translated by J. P. ARTHUR. (London: Kegan Paul, 1906.)

IN the two books named above Thomas Haemerken, generally called à Kempis, records the interior history of the great revival of Christian life in the Low Countries, to which nearly his whole life (1379-1471) was given. These books will be precious to a few devout layfolk, and to students interested in the history of the spiritual renaissance with which the name of à Kempis is connected. But they will be a treasure to all religious communities in England, and will supply reading for refectories not only historical and interesting, but breathing also the purest tone of monastic devotion among Teutonic nations in the fifteenth century.

The former work gives us memoirs of Gerard, surnamed Groote,<sup>1</sup> and of his disciple and successor, Florentius, who

<sup>1</sup> The spelling varies greatly in proper names. Groote, Groot, and Groet are used indifferently. Gerhard is sometimes used, more often Gerard. The true Dutch form is Girrit Groet. Radewins is the patronymic form, Radewin the individual's name.

are regarded as the founders of the revival called 'the New Devotion,' and adds the author's personal recollections of nine of the early members of the Brotherhood, clerical and lay, of whom no less than six died of the plague, or the Black Death, which devastated the Low Countries at this time. The lives are strung together by a slight thread of dialogue between 'the Elder Brother'—that is, à Kempis, the author—and a 'Novice,' and were intended to form an appendix to his *Dialogus Novitiorum*. The translator's introduction gives a learned sketch of the conditions, ecclesiastical and political, which prevailed in Europe during the time covered by the lives of Gerard and his followers.

In the other, à Kempis is constrained to put together a short chronicle concerning the beginning of the house of the Canons Regular of Mount St. Agnes.<sup>1</sup> He gathers together a few things out of many, 'and these,' he says, 'I have seen with mine own eyes, or have heard from the Elders of our House, or else have gathered from the writings of others.'

In both books the writer often alludes to the deep ecclesiastical corruption of his times, which affected the religious as well as the secular clergy; but he never for an instant despairs of monastic religion. His ideal is monastic: he lived his life under monastic rule, and traces the conversion of the founder of his own fraternity to the austere of religious orders—'the order,' he says, 'in which, indeed, the light of the Heavenly Life remained, though hidden'—the Carthusians. The style and tone of both works are essentially mediæval. We find chapters devoted to the inquiry into the mystical meaning of the names of Gerard Groote and of Florentius and his father Radewin. Yet, although we are still so unmistakably in the Middle Ages, we feel already the thunder in the air which was soon to set free in the Western Church the wildest forces of revolution, and men

<sup>1</sup> A strictly monastic Order which grew out of, and was recruited from, the more loosely associated 'Brotherhood of the Common Life.' À Kempis began his conversion as a poor scholar in the Brotherhood, and went on to profession in the convent of the Canons Regular.

spoke of the world 'growing old' as if with a vague fear of divine judgements soon to fall upon a Christendom so deeply corrupted. Nevertheless, the spirit of the book is naïvely uncontroversial and evangelical; for the saintly writer, though he does not spare the vices of high ecclesiastics, neither doubt nor controversy exists; he is absolutely loyal to the authority of Christ and of the Patriarch of the West.

The reader will be charmed by the admirable style of the translation. It reads like the purest English of some undefined date, as free from irritating archaisms as from incongruous modernisms. The story flows on with such transparent simplicity that we forget that we are reading a translation. It has the gravity and directness of diction which belong to its subject and monastic origin. The reader is aware that it is not the English of to-day, but there is never a suspicion of a dead language, or of an antique style imitated.

In order to estimate the value of the movement recorded in these books one should keep prominently in view the extraordinary corruption in the Church which gave occasion for it. This may be inferred by the stress which Gerard lays on the evils of pluralism. According to Hallam, quoted in the introduction to *The Founders*, there were cases of fifty or even sixty benefices being held by a single incumbent.<sup>1</sup> Out of such spiritual gloom emerges the light of the New Devotion. Gerard, the brilliant Master of Arts at eighteen, canon of the church of Aix, and possessor already of other benefices, through the influence of the Carthusians is converted,

<sup>1</sup> See also *The Chronicle of the Canons*, p. 212. 'A certain aged man and an honoured priest spake in my hearing of this drouth and failure of devotion, and referring to the time of which I tell, he said that in the days of his youth, and in these parts of the Low Countries, all things pertaining to devotion and charity were so brought to nothingness, that if any were touched inwardly by a desire to amend his life, he would scarce find one single man from whom to ask counsel; nor scarce one spot where he could put these fledgling desires into a place of safety, unless it were among the Carthusians; for amongst them Religious observance and the vigour of spiritual life did flourish at that time, but scarce amongst any others.'

resigns his preferments, and dedicates his life to Christ with the aim of reviving spiritual life in the Church by conferences to the clergy and convents, and by preaching missions in towns and country villages.

‘Such was the inclination amongst the people to hear the word of God, that [wherever he went] the church could scarcely contain the crowd that came together. . . . He often delivered two sermons in one day, and sometimes continued preaching for three hours or more when fervency of spirit took hold upon him.’<sup>1</sup>

What was specially remarkable in this revival was the endeavour to associate the converted together for mutual sympathy, counsel, and support. And out of the frequent religious meetings which followed Gerard’s mission in each place there grew permanent associations: ‘He ordained that if any should wish to abide continually together, they should earn their own living by the labour of their hands, and, as far as might be, live in common under the discipline of the Church.’<sup>2</sup> It is certain that Gerard had in mind to gather into communities the men whom his preaching inspired with the desire of a life of self-sacrifice, and that he gave effect to his plans by resigning his own house at Deventer to a community of widows and maidens whom he associated with a priest as their director. The inmates, whether in the houses of men or of women, were not to take permanent vows; for he desired these societies to be a link between the Regulars and the people. Any member of this free brotherhood who felt called to a stricter life might go on to religious vows in some convent; but of those who lived in the houses of the Common Life, any was free to depart when he would. The object of this freer association was that the spiritual influence of the converts might be felt more widely. While they kept in touch with the lives of the people, they might help outsiders towards a pious life, and be the more awake to the needs of the poor and the sick. None was allowed to beg; they must maintain their common table by their own labour, according to their trade and capacity, and all that they could earn

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 45.



beyond a bare maintenance was to be given to the poor. With a view to strengthening these pious societies he was very anxious to found one or more monasteries of Canons Regular who might minister to the Brethren of the Common Life, and help them to preserve their spiritual tone and discipline. Through these, also, he hoped to reach and to influence the clergy generally and the Religious Orders. Young converts trained in the Brother-houses, if found fit, might be sent on to the monasteries; and young clerics might be prepared in them for the vocation of Regulars or Seculars.

Gerard Groote's friend, Lambert Steurman, left money for the founding of the first monastery, and Groote advised the adoption of the rule of Canons Regular of St. Augustine. This he did partly out of reverence for Ruysbroeck and his devout Augustinian fathers at Grünthal, and partly because he regarded this order as more accessible to persons seeking spiritual counsel than other orders.

Gerard died before he could give full effect to his plans. While attending his friend Lambert, who was smitten with the plague, he caught the infection, and died at Deventer at the age of forty-four. Florentius, his disciple whom he had designated to succeed him, lost no time in carrying out the wishes of his spiritual father, and put in hand the erection of a monastery as soon as was possible. First Windesheim, then St. Agnes, near Zwolle, and afterwards other houses of Augustinian Canons were founded. He at the same time set about the organization of houses for the Brothers and for the Sisters of the Common Life.

The houses of the Brothers were presided over by a superior who was called 'Rector,' while the secular affairs were entrusted to a 'Procurator.' Other duties were distributed among the Brothers, as in monasteries. The Brothers were some of them priests, some in minor orders, and some laymen. They came together from all classes of society; the high-born, the rich, the men of letters, as well as working men were represented in their fellowship. Each worked according to his previous training; the copying of MSS., and later the printing of books (of which latter

specimens may be seen in the British Museum), formed the higher part of the work, while some laboured in the fields and followed other rough employments. But it was distinctly on the education of boys and young men that the energies of the new societies were chiefly concentrated, and with the most important results; for, in consequence of the high character of their schools, the houses of the Common Life soon spread through a large part of the Netherlands and of Germany.<sup>1</sup> Gerard Groote, himself a brilliant scholar, was specially interested in promoting the Christian life among students of the universities. One of his chief friends was the celebrated John Cele, headmaster of the town school of Zwolle, who was as anxious for the spiritual welfare of his pupils as for their intellectual progress. The impulse thus transmitted to the Brothers of the Common Life persisted so remarkably that a large number of the municipalities in Holland and Germany invited the Brothers to settle in their towns, and provided them with houses in order that they might undertake permanently the religious instruction in their schools.<sup>2</sup> This very valuable part of their work continued into the time of the Lutheran Reformation, when, as champions of the counter-Reformation, the Jesuits got most of the schools into their hands. Several of the Brother-houses, however, survived up to the time of Napoleon.

In what follows an attempt is made to select a few passages, chiefly from *The Founders*, which may give the

<sup>1</sup> Erasmus and John Wessel are counted among their more famous pupils; so also was Nicolas of Cusa, cardinal and Reformer, who, as readers of a recent article (*C.Q.R.*, April 1906) will remember, endowed the school at Deventer with a substantial sum for the benefit of students as poor as he himself had been. Cusa, we are told, 'grieved only that the good brothers could never teach him fluency in Latin. The Low Dutch,' he says, 'by reason of their Teutonic origin, are incapable of fine scholarship'!

<sup>2</sup> Schulze counts twenty-two Brother-houses in the Netherlands and eighteen in Germany; at least eighty-seven of the Sister-houses were founded in the Netherlands and in Germany. Vornken (writing in 1455) asks, 'Where is there a place where there is not a Sister-house of the devout?' The Sisters were occupied in miniature painting, household work, teaching girls, and copying books.

reader some impressions of à Kempis, which cannot be gained from his greater work, the *Imitation*—of à Kempis as schoolboy and chorister, among the brethren at Deventer, and later as Master of the Novices at Mount St. Agnes. Here his enthusiastic veneration for the spiritual fathers of the movement to whom he owed his conversion will appear, and their genuine greatness—something, too, of the wonderful influence of the revival kindled by their heroic simplicity.

In *The Founders of the New Devotion*, which is an appendix to his *Dialogus Novitiorum*, à Kempis gives us short Lives of—

The Reverend Master Gerard the Great, commonly called Groote.

The Reverend Florentius, a devout Priest, and [a] Vicar of the Church of Deventer.

John Gronde, priest.

John Brinckerinck, priest.

Lubert Berner, priest.

Henry Brune, priest.

Gerard of Zutphen, librarian.

Amilius of Buren, priest, successor of Florentius.

James of Viana, priest.

John Cacabus, or Ketel, the cook.

Arnold of Schoonhoven, clerk.

The work was written after 1440, when the author was upwards of sixty years of age.

The debt of the Church to Master Gerard as a leader in monastic reform is significantly expressed by à Kempis : 'He shall be held in perpetual memory, a teacher following the regulations of the orthodox faith ; who by his pious example restored the position of our Holy Religion.' He was born to wealth and honour, endowed with attractive qualities, with literary tastes and ambition. He took the degree of Master of Arts at Paris, as we have seen, at the age of eighteen, and was rewarded with preferment in the Church, receiving among other benefices a canonry in the church of Aix. All this time 'he walked in the broad ways of the world, until by the mercy of God he was changed into another man.' The account of his conversion gives occasion

for the author's judgement of the state of society at the moment.

'The disposition of the world' (he says) 'seemed to be on all sides turned to evil, so that there were few who preached the Word of Life both by example and precept, and fewer still who followed the rule of continency; and this was above all things lamentable, that those who professed the name of Holy Religion and the state of the Devout Life through lack of inspiration followed but lamely in the footprints of the Fathers who had gone before.'<sup>1</sup>

But if the clergy and the Religious Orders generally were corrupt or lukewarm, the Carthusians were always a splendid exception. It was to the affectionate influence of the Carthusian Prior of Monchuysen that Gerard's conversion was granted, and it was during a three years' retreat spent at the fervent heart of a Carthusian house that the change, expressed by his sudden resignation of all his preferments, was tested and finally established. Strengthened by this course of self-discipline, prayer, and study, he began to preach missions in towns and country villages with great effect. He had many opponents, but bore all their malignity with perfect patience and without discouragement.

His visit with two congenial companions to John Ruysbroeck, the mystic, at his monastery of Grünthal, was one of the happiest events in his life, and had a permanent influence on his character and aims. A pleasant chapter tells of the manner of his private life among his disciples and devout companions:

'It was his custom to be satisfied almost always with but one meal in the day. . . . He avoided intercourse with worldly men, and also those lengthy banquets in which rich men indulge themselves to the loss of the poor. . . . Nevertheless he invited to his frugal table certain poor servants of God, and sometimes one or two of the honourable burghers, so as to instruct them in a better life: and these he regaled rather with the sweets of heavenly discourse than with carefully prepared courses of meats, for such he by no means provided. . . . His conversation was seasoned with salt, and thoughts of devotion to God, and

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 9.

the health of the soul gave to his food a savour beyond that of any pleasant meat. He ever remembered as he sat at meat the heavenly table in the kingdom of God, and the sweet fellowship of the Saints which should follow our long exile in this present world. Thus he sent away his guests joyful in the Lord, and having their hearts pricked. He had a refectory of modest size, in which a few guests could sit with him, where near at hand and over against the table there stood a case filled with most excellent books to serve as it were for a wine-cellar, so that if the fare for the body were not pleasing, he might from this abundant supply put before his friends a draught of wine for the soul. . . . He used to prepare his food with his own hands, though he had no skill in cookery.<sup>1</sup>

After an interesting chapter on his love of reading the Holy Scriptures, there follows a curious passage referring to art magic :

'It is said that Gerard had been skilled in astrology and necromancy, and before his conversion had been in the habit of displaying some few of the tricks of the art of magic : but I have learned from two of his pupils that more than these cannot be charged to him, for when one of these pupils asked him the truth of the matter, he said : "I did indeed learn the theory of that art, and I read and possessed books upon it, but I had no dealings with the follies of magical practice." Moreover a faithful pupil of Gerard, who was also a devout priest, added for my further information on this questionable matter the following explanation. "There are," he said, "two kinds of necromancy, of which one is called 'natural.' This kind is a most recondite study, and its difference from the second kind (which is called 'diabolic' and is forbidden by law), is perceived by but few persons. Gerard was learned in the natural kind, but I believe that he had not studied the other, nor had made any compact with the Devil." But . . . whether he had dealings [with this science or not], he purged any foolishness or defilement that might have clung to him therefrom, by bringing forth fruits meet for repentance when he was wholly turned to God. In witness of this when smitten with sickness he renounced all unlawful arts in the presence of a priest, and gave the books that dealt of such vanities to be burned in the fire.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 26-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 37-8.

In his public profession of faith, he says, addressing himself :

'Nor shalt thou be willing to practise astrology at the bidding of any ; nor oughtest thou to let any man in the world persuade thee to have dealings with any forbidden science since these are in themselves evil in many ways, they cause distrust and suspicion, and they are forbidden. Also it is thy duty, so far as it is possible, to drive away these superstitions and all other curious arts from the minds of men, preserving a quiet mind, purity, and liberty of will. . . . Thou shalt never observe the seasons that are held to be propitious for journeying, or for blood-letting or for any other thing save in the material sense of considering the density of the atmosphere, for such curious choice is forbidden in the decrees and by the Holy Fathers. . . . Since we should not be anxious as to what we shall eat, how much less should we be so about the forecasts of the stars ? It is needful for every Christian to abandon himself in purity of heart, and to commit himself to God.' <sup>1</sup>

In the chapter which records his happy death there is a curious and touching account of a visit paid to him when on his death-bed :

'At this time there came also to him certain devout scholars who had been smitten with the sickness of the Plague, desiring to hear from him some wholesome word as a medicine for their souls. To these he spoke with clemency, saying : "By continuing ever in the Service of God, if ye are well disposed thereunto, ye can meet death with confidence ; all those lectures which ye have heard shall be counted unto you as prayers to God, by reason of the pious intention which ye have had towards Him in your studies." Hearing this the young men were comforted, and returning to their own hospice, departed this life having made a good confession, commending their souls, which were redeemed by the Blood of Christ, to God and to the Holy Angels.' <sup>2</sup>

Gerard died 'in the time of the pestilence,' in the forty-fourth year of his age, on the feast of St. Bernard, A.D. 1384.

A Kempis proceeds in the next memoir to collect his personal reminiscences of the Master Florentius, the actual

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 55-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 48-9.

founder of the Brotherhood of the Common Life, of whom he writes with special tenderness and enthusiasm as of the instrument of his own conversion and the guide of his life :

'I confess' (he says) 'that I am not so skilful as to be able to set forth the life of so great a father; yet I do offer in the temple of God goat skins to cover the roof of the tabernacle, for I have no precious stones wherewith to adorn the vestment of the priest. Also it would seem to me an ungrateful thing if I should keep silence as to the virtues of a father so beloved though I am unworthy to tell of them, for in his life he was a benefactor to me and to many others: he first launched me for the service of God, and in the fulness of time steered me to the haven of the monastery. Wherefore in gratitude and for a sweet remembrance of him I in turn do gladly repay his bounty, now he is gone, by the finishing of this poor work.'<sup>1</sup>

Among all his disciples Gerard Groote held Florentius in highest regard 'for the special beauty and modesty of his character'; and Florentius in turn loved the master as his dearest father, 'the begetter of his salvation.' The master and disciple were mutually drawn together and

'held sweet converse upon the things that pertain to salvation; the heart of each burned with an heavenly flame; the things of earth were of none account, but their good purpose to hold to the service of God was confirmed. For setting an holy life before them, and being zealous to keep citizenship in the country of the Lord, they were made thenceforward of one mind in the love of the Brotherhood.'<sup>2</sup>

The next chapter tells 'how Florentius, now fully converted, did convert many others,' and how the many clerical and lay converts 'associated themselves together in Christ after the Apostolic manner; and they rejoiced with eager hearts to keep a Common table, and to have meagre sustenance.' These proceedings provoked a natural outburst of worldly derision and anger :

'but with modest aspect, like some flower of the field, Florentius went forth clad in a gray habit covered with a long cloak; and

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 96.



as some lily may grow among thorns and give forth her sweet odour when torn thereby, so was Florentius among his mockers ; when derided he became yet more cheerful and made the odour of his fame yet sweeter and more widely diffused by the patience which he showed.' <sup>1</sup>

His master Gerard, who procured his ordination to the priesthood, bears this remarkable witness to his disciple, saying : ' Once only did I cause a man to be ordained to the priesthood and I believe that he is worthy. In future I will be cautious not to do such a thing lightly, for I perceive that few are fit for such a calling.'

A beautiful chapter tells of his ' instructive demeanour as he stood in the Choir' :

' He utterly avoided honour from men, and for this cause refused to go out into public places, and thought it his sole comfort to abide at home with his Brethren, for he knew that thereby he would make more progress himself and that his conduct would be an example of stability of purpose to others. And when he did go out into the streets he walked quickly, nowhere engaging in much talk . . . but as he went to the church he would pray or meditate of God as the Holy Spirit moved him.' <sup>2</sup>

Enfeebled by excessive abstinence in the first fervour of his devotion at the beginning of his conversion,

' he could not go daily into the Choir ; yet on all great festivals, and on the anniversaries of Saints he rejoiced to attend Vespers so often as his health allowed, and to be present at High Mass. . . . Being devoutly intent upon God and his own soul, he sang the Psalms so far as his weakness allowed in a low tone, observing the musical directions. He was so reverent and his aspect was so devout that many boys and chanters often gazed at him and admired his religious fervour, since no light-mindedness, for which he might be blamed, could be seen in any word or gesture. At that time I used to go into the Choir with the other scholars as I was ordered to do by Master John Boheme, who ruled the Scholars and Choristers strictly. And as often as I saw my Master Florentius standing there—though he did not look round—I was

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 98-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 103.

careful not to chatter, for I was awed by his presence because of the reverence of his posture.

'Once on a time it happened when I was standing near him in the Choir that he turned to share our book for the chanting, and he, standing behind me, put his hands upon my shoulder—but I stood still, hardly daring to move, bewildered with gratification at so great an honour . . . the whole Choir was enlightened by the instructive demeanour of this great priest.'<sup>1</sup>

À Kempis delights to recall every incident of his association with the master.

'I myself' (he says), 'unworthy as I am, often made ready his table at his request [he was unable through infirmity to join the community at table] and brought from the buttery that modest draught which he desired, and I gladly served him with much cheerfulness of spirit.'

Florentius followed the opinion of Gerard 'that none should be admitted to the Community save he who was willing—according to the saying of St. Paul—to labour with his hands. . . . And he himself set a bright example before the copyists, that . . . he might enhance his priestly office by being a pattern of industry; wherefore he busied himself with smoothing the parchment and ruling and arranging the pages. For though he was less skilful as a copyist, yet with his own hand—though consecrated with the holy oil—he gave great help to the other writers by preparing all things necessary for their use.'

'This notable lover of Chastity hid not the light of his benevolence from the little ones, and the young who were striving after innocence of life and purity, but with pious words taught them to love Jesus and Mary, exhorting them to preserve their innocence. . . . To the sad and tempted he was cheerful and comfortable, so that if any were troubled or offended, the sight of Florentius, and a few words from him, would give such an one peace and consolation and he would return joyfully to his own business. *This I have often tried in my own person.*'<sup>2</sup>

There were blind and lame among his converts :

'I knew also a leper' (continues à Kempis) 'who abode outside the city walls who in the grace of devotion came near to God's priest, and spoke with him as a friend; and many saw this and wondered at the humility of the Master in sitting by a

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 103-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 109-111, 114.

leper. He also commanded that a draught of wine and a special dole should be given to the man, and after speaking many words of holy comfort to him he let him go away to his own abode with his companion.' <sup>1</sup>

During Lent the Brethren were wont, for the sake of the poor, to add one hour of daily work to the usual period of labour,<sup>2</sup> and to hand the whole that they might gain by their copying in that hour to the overseer of the poor that therewith he might buy them necessary victual and faithfully minister to them.

Much is recorded of the Master's gracious hospitality to poor students. For example :

'In the month of May, the Season when the wild herbs that are used as medicaments have their highest virtue, the good Father did not forget his poor ; knowing that many were weak, ulcerous, and full of sores, he made them to come to his house upon an appointed day and hour to receive certain medicines, and to have their bodies bathed in warm water infused with aromatic herbs. And when they had been thoroughly bathed and washed he made ready for each a most cleanly bed for sudorific treatment. And after receiving a cup of wine, and some words of comfort, they went away with great joy to their own homes, saying one to the other : "How good and loving a man is this Lord Florentius ! and how good are the Brethren who dwell with him ! in that they give us such things for the Sake of God without money and without price !" ' <sup>3</sup>

À Kempis, the 'Elder Brother,' delights, in his dialogue with the Novice, to dwell upon the first fervour of their institute.

'This Community of Brothers' (he says) 'dwelling in the house of Florentius was wholly pleasing to God and beloved of Him. . . . Lowliness, which therein was the chief of all virtues, was sought after by all from the lowest to the highest ;

<sup>1</sup> *Founders, l.c.*

<sup>2</sup> Principally of copying, later of printing books.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 115-6. One of the rules of the houses founded by Florentius was 'to take charge of the sick and infirm wherever they be found, and to minister to their bodily and spiritual needs.' See also *The Chronicle*, p. 177, 'Of Everard, a Curate in Almelo and a great master of physic.'

and did make a Paradise of this earthly house, transforming mortal men into heavenly pearls to be as living stones meet for glory in the temple of God.' <sup>1</sup>

Nor does he fail to contrast with that good beginning the traces of spiritual decay which he has lived to see in a later generation :

' Yet now (fie upon it) there are some who having deserted their first enthusiasm, love to wander abroad, delight in vain talking, prefer their own wisdom to the primitive institutions of our Fathers, and to justify the satisfaction of their own desires, employ cunning arguments in place of obeying the Holy Law.' <sup>2</sup>

Among the writers of the greatest Christian books there is perhaps hardly one of whose personality we should so much desire to know something as of the author of the *Imitation* ; yet no other book more completely hides the writer. In this *Dialogus Novitiorum*, however, where the ' Elder Brother ' recounts to a younger generation the spiritual glories of an earlier day, à Kempis sometimes forgets his austere impersonality. He could not help telling the novices of the awe he felt of the venerable and beloved Master Florentius when as a chattering schoolboy and chorister he became aware of the saint behind him singing out of the same book with his hand resting on the child's shoulder. We feel that the gravest of Novice-Masters has a smile on his face while he recalls the humours of the kitchen of the Brotherhood at Deventer. His evident pleasure in telling us of John Ketel, ' formerly a wealthy merchant, now become a poor cook, and an humble Brother,' is itself a revelation of the writer's character. We recognize throughout the book the author of the *Imitation*, as, for instance, when he writes of the same brother cook that ' he was often found praying on bended knee before the kitchen fire, and while his hands held the cooking-vessels his mouth poured forth devout Psalms. He made the kitchen an house of prayer, for he knew that God is everywhere.' But we discover another side of the most serious

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 166

of writers when of the same Brother Ketel, the cook, he lets us know that while a wealthy merchant in the world,

'he had designed to climb by the ladder of learning to the dignity of a Priest of the Church,' but 'did afterwards put aside all desire for the pinnacle of honour and the pride of dignity, and sought the lowest room. . . . While he had continued in the world he had prepared him certain priestly vestments adorned in costly wise, and having designs inwoven in golden thread. So gorgeous were they that the bishop of a cathedral, or a ruling abbot, might have been honoured in the wearing of them. But now being informed to his soul's health by the Spirit of God, John put aside and rejected all of these, and selling to others his chasuble and silken cope, vested himself in vile rags, a dark tunic and a gray cloak, being purposed to serve in the kitchen.'<sup>1</sup>

There is a cheerful sense of humour in this descent from the 'ladder of learning' to the basement, and from the silken cope to the cook's soiled apron.

In a few lines the author accounts for the disposition of his whole life from boyhood. In the days of his youth he came to Deventer to study, and at his brother's suggestion sought counsel of Florentius :

'When I came into the presence of the reverend Father he kept me for a while with him in his house, being moved thereto by fatherly affection ; and he placed me in the School, and besides this gave me the books which he thought I needed. Afterwards he obtained for me a lodging, at no cost to myself, with a certain honourable and devout matron, who often showed kindness to me and many other Clerks. So being associated with this man who was so holy, and with the Brothers of his Order, I had their devout lives daily in my mind and before my eyes, and I took pleasure and delight in the contemplation of their godly conduct, and in the gracious words which proceeded from the mouths of these humble men. Never before could I recollect to have seen such men, so devout and fervent were they in the love of God and of their neighbour.'<sup>2</sup>

À Kempis refers again in his short *Life of Arnold of Schoonhoven*, a young clerk, his companion, to his first impressions of the Brotherhood.

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 237.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 170.

'At this same time' (he says), 'by the aid and counsel of Florentius, I also took up my abode in this house, and continued in the Community for about a year, having Arnold as my companion, for we were content to share one little cell and bed. Here indeed I learned to write, to read the Holy Scripture and books on moral subjects, and to hear devout discourses; but it was chiefly through the sweet conversation of the Brethren that I was inspired yet more strongly to despise the world; and by the pious admonitions of Arnold I was holpen and instructed every day. All that I was then able to earn by writing I gave for the expenses of the Community, and what I lacked the generous piety of my beloved Father Florentius defrayed for me, for he succoured me in every way like a father.'<sup>1</sup>

And here in the great ascetic, while yet a 'chattering chorister,' is the first kindling of the spiritual desire which years after flamed in the *De Imitatione Christi* for all the ages.

'It sometimes happened that though he wist not of it, I stood by and noted secretly what he [Arnold] did, and was set on fire by his fervour in prayer, for I desired that I too might sometimes feel a devotion like to that which he seemed to feel every day. Nor was it wonderful that one who kept careful ward over his heart and lips wherever he went, should be devout in prayer, for the sound of joy was heard from his mouth by reason of the most sweet savour of his devotion, as if he were partaking of delectable food, according to that saying of the Psalmist: "The high praises of God shall be in their lips."'<sup>2</sup>

These short memoirs supply a living key to the *Imitation*. The manly and humble companions of Thomas à Kempis' boyhood, and of the days of his conversion, are for him the book, as it were, in which he learnt to read and understand the doctrine of Christ. In his summary of the life of his dear friend Arnold, for instance, how easily we recognize a source of the ideal which the *Imitation* presents. After speaking of the spirit of obedience which distinguished him, he concludes:

'For these things' sake he had great peace of heart and was dear alike to God and man, being willing and ready to do

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 257-8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 259.

all that was commanded him, as one that rejoiceth ever in the Lord.' <sup>1</sup>

The book supplies also touches of the human kindness which appeals to all hearts alike, and which finds little place in the austere monastic ideal of the *Imitation*. Here, for instance, he throws a tender light on a young postulant's relations with his family at home :

'A scholar who wished to write a letter to his parents was doing so by Lubert's advice in his cell, and I was present with them. Then Florentius came in and said : "What do ye?" and Lubert answered with respect, "My companion is writing a letter to his parents," to which that most kindly Father replied : "Write on, that thy name may be written down for Life Eternal." The young man aforesaid afterward became a devout Religious.' <sup>2</sup>

In another passage austerity itself is criticized in the community :

'There were two Clerks talking to one another of Lubert, and one of them said : "I think that he weareth too austere an aspect ; gladly would I speak to him sometimes, but I dare not ;" to which the other answered : "If it seem good to thee I will tell him of it and perchance he may amend himself." The Clerk therefore came to Lubert, and said : "I would fain have some talk with thee," and Lubert said, "Say on." Then that other said to him : "Some are offended in thee because thou dost walk with such austerity, and dost look sourly upon them, wherefore they dare not to approach thee and speak with thee. I pray thee be more complaisant and kindly affectionate in thy manner of speech, that they may come freely to thee." Then the humble Lubert answered : "Most gladly will I amend myself through the Grace of God, and I thank thee that thou hast admonished me." From that hour he was as it were another man, and he looked more cheerfully upon those that approached him, though he maintained a due and proper gravity.' <sup>3</sup>

It is interesting to observe in the society of men the irresistible attractiveness of genuine piety, and to recognize in Christian congregations so far back in history the same

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 262.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 185.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 187-8.



personal differences of taste and feeling which divide us still :

'Once in winter time he [Henry Brune<sup>1</sup>] was sitting by the fire, warming his hands, but he turned his face to the wall and secretly continued his prayers, observing strictly the rule of silence. And I, when I saw this, was greatly edified, and loved him yet the more, nor did I ever hear a complaint concerning him save that he celebrated Mass somewhat more slowly than the others ; and yet by so doing he drew many laymen to devotion when he celebrated, and this tardiness was readily excused to him since it sprang from his unwillingness to be separated from his beloved Jesus.'<sup>2</sup>

Of this same Henry Brune two happy things are recorded in which à Kempis, the writer of the memoir, is associated with him : 'Sometimes on feast days he celebrated before the lepers by leave of Florentius, and I served him on those occasions.'<sup>3</sup> The other is a noble example of spiritual unselfishness.

'Once he went with the Brothers to obtain indulgences at Arnheim,<sup>4</sup> and while they were in the way he was asked for what consideration he would give up his indulgences. To this he replied : "I would gladly give them all in exchange for this grace, that whensoever I should say anything good to anyone, he should straightway be converted and amend his life." The Brothers who heard it were marvellously edified by his good reply which proceeded from that earnest zeal for souls which dwelt within his pious and pure heart.'<sup>5</sup>

Of such a life here follows the fit conclusion :

'In the year of our Lord 1439 the plague was raging at Zutphen where the Brothers of the House of Florentius, and many other Religious, then dwelt, having fled from Deventer ; and Henry Brune fell sick with the disease, and lay at the point of death, waiting to receive the reward of his labours from the

<sup>1</sup> A Brother 'of deep devotion and a priest of angelic purity.'

<sup>2</sup> *Founders*, pp. 214-5.

<sup>3</sup> There existed at this period 19,000 leper-houses in Europe. See Sprengel's *Histoire de la Médecine*.

<sup>4</sup> A branch house from the monastery of Windesheim.

<sup>5</sup> *Founders*, p. 218.

Hand of the Lord. . . . Throughout his days he laboured at the work of writing, and I have often seen him washing vessels in the kitchen, and doing other lowly tasks. He knew scarcely anything save the things that pertain to God and the salvation of souls, nor cared to speak of aught else. And that which had been the habit of his life he maintained unto death, for he recited all the Hours till the very moment that he gave up his soul, nor during his illness did he cease his reading of the Holy Scriptures, for he sought comfort rather in the Word of God than in the discourses of men.' <sup>1</sup>

There is no feature of Christian devotion more essential to the monastic idea than this love of the Divine Office, the continual recitation of the Psalter; and there is perhaps no devotion which is more alien and unintelligible to the modern spirit. Here, for instance, is Mr. Brierley's <sup>2</sup> estimate of it:

'The idea that there was no other food for the soul than that they [the monks] had known narrowed immeasurably their outlook. Imagine for instance the sheer waste of time, in a world with a million things to learn, that has gone on for centuries as the result of the monkish theory of the religious feelings! Think of people, as in the Eastern Church, going through the daily repetition of the Psalms, going through the same eternal round at Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Compline, with what good to God or man? How weary the heavens must be of this ceaseless grind of words! And there is so much to do that is useful!'

That minds fed upon the daily recitation of the Psalms must be narrow is obvious to those who judge the devout life from the outside. A more thoughtful and sympathetic writer <sup>3</sup> has lately illustrated the very opposite thesis, and one who is still with us, and whose life for the last sixty years has been nourished by the daily recitation of the Psalms, writes thus:

'We must say the Psalter with the consciousness that it is the inheritance of the Communion of Saints. What multitudes have been perfected in the life of Christ while these words of

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, pp. 218-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Problems of Living*, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life*.

power filled their hearts, rose from their lips, ruled their lives, checked their fears, deepened their penitence, stimulated their hopes, formulated their thanksgivings, spiritualised their aspirations, glorified their aims, brightened their sufferings, supported them in weariness, encouraged them in their struggle, transfigured the dulness of earthly circumstances with the brilliancy of heavenly realities.' <sup>1</sup>

The devotion of the continual recitation of the Psalms, to which every clergyman of the Church of England is bound to-day, raised the men who followed it in the Middle Ages to a moral and spiritual elevation from which they could see beyond the low horizon of their own times and of all time.<sup>2</sup> It is only in the fellowship of their simple prayerfulness and meditation on Holy Scripture that we can enter at all into the meaning of such lives as these which à Kempis preserves for us. But from that point of view they appear not imprisoned and beclouded by superstition, but enfranchised, illuminated souls, perfectly reasonable, brave, kind, and joyful. And a proof of this is found in the irresistible attractiveness which these manly and simple characters, the friends and companions of à Kempis, exercised upon young men, not only on the spiritually refined, but upon the poor and rough students of the day, German and Flemish, awaking in them the highest of all ambitions—the ambition of the spiritual life and of the love of God.

There is a very touching illustration of this spiritual power of the Psalter in the book we are considering. Gerard and his spiritual son, a younger priest who always accompanied him in his missionary expeditions, have just said their Office together, as usual, on the way. One imagines the two going along in silence, feeling a certain unexpressed consolation of spiritual fellowship in the devotion which they have just finished. This vague feeling awakes in the elder a sense of a deeper spiritual need, and a desire for a surer consciousness of the spiritual good

<sup>1</sup> *Cowley Evangelist*, November 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dean Church, *Discipline of the Christian Character*: 'In the Book of Psalms the religious affections are full-grown: it was the highest expression of them which the world was to see. The profoundest religious thinkers have met there what they feel after.'

which unites them. So after a silence the Master questions his younger friend as to the Psalter which they have just been saying together. It opens heaven to him; he wants to be sure that it is no mere mechanical toil to his companion. But the disciple has not courage to respond to the Master's challenge; he opposes an instinctive reserve; he cannot for modesty speak of such personal things with his superior—what he has or has not experienced spiritually. This moves the elder to make an unwonted revelation of his own inmost mind to his companion. He is deeply moved, and opens the secret of what his daily Psalter discovers to him, and it is not the arid desert of an ever-dwindling soul:

'He had one John of Zutphen to minister to him, who was surnamed Brinckerinc, a devout clerk of stablished character and one dedicated to God from his youth: he was wont to recite the "Hours" with Gerard, and to accompany him hither and thither when he preached, and Gerard loved him with the love of a father for his son, for indeed he was a youth of an excellent spirit, well beloved of God and man, and scarcely could be torn from his master's side.'

'Upon a time when they had made an end of reading the "Hours," Gerard said to him: "Of what thinkest thou? Understandest thou what thou readest? Tell me what is in thy mind." But he replied to his master, "How should I understand except some man should guide me?" Then said Gerard to his disciple: "To me there come divers and mystic interpretations, and they lead my mind secretly from one meaning to another so that I could feel no weariness in reading, but should rejoice to dwell some while longer upon these good words."' <sup>1</sup>

À Kempis adds that:

'Often while reciting the "Hours" he broke forth with the voice of joy through the superabundance of grace which was shed upon him, and in sweet sounding hymns poured forth his inward rejoicing; and as he sang softly within his heart, his spirit, as a flame, was borne upward to God.' <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Founders*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 30-1. This reminds one of Richard Rolle of Hampole (1300-1349) and his 'Canor,' a degree of contemplation in which for spiritual joy he could no longer say, he must *sing* his Psalter.

A writer in the *Spectator*, commenting from the literary point of view upon the extraordinary influence which the Psalter has had on Christians of all races and in all times, explains it thus :

‘The Psalms, like the Hebrew Scriptures generally, have in them the seeds of the Eternal—of truth and love, of that which reveals God to man, and reconciles justice with mercy. . . . The Psalms as a whole have embedded in them that which can stimulate, encourage, and illuminate the Christian life.’<sup>1</sup>

But Father Baker (1575-1641), from the purely practical and spiritual point of view, sees much further; he concludes that ‘in ancient times many holy souls did attain to perfect contemplation by the mere use of vocal prayer’ (referring especially to the daily recitation of the Psalter). And he proceeds to teach how to use the Psalter as an exercise in interior prayer.<sup>2</sup>

In the Life of Lubert Berner one note is touched strangely discordant with Christian feeling at the present day in regard to the virtue of humility. Were it not for the unquestionable gravity of the austere writer’s tone, we might have supposed that he intended to make us merry by a community joke of the time :

‘When he [Lubert] read aloud during meal-time he would make mistakes of set purpose that he might be corrected by the Brother whose duty it was to do so, and sometimes he pretended not to have heard that he might be corrected yet more fully, for he desired to be put to confusion and to be held a dullard for not being able to read better. But Gerard of Zutphen, whose duty it was to correct such errors at meal-time, perceiving that his mistakes arose not through ignorance only but through his virtue of humility, abstained from correcting him a second time. He had a manly voice as of a trumpet, and read in very seemly wise.’<sup>3</sup>

If only we might attribute our own bad reading to-day in

<sup>1</sup> October 22, 1904, a review of Mr. Prothero’s book named above.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Sancta Sophia*, edited by Serenus Cressy, reprinted (Burns and Oates), pp. 344, 348.

<sup>3</sup> *Foundaers*, pp. 188-9.

church and refectory to *humility*, even in its most infantine form !

There is no room to quote at length from the *Chronicles*, which are full of unconscious witness to the manly devotion and Christian simplicity of the movement. We find numbers of men of humble position so attracted by the life of the Brethren as to spend all their days with them in hard manual toil, in the fields, in fishing, in the care of the cattle, as Donates, Resignates, or fellow-Commoners ; and sometimes after many years of this unpaid service of charity, one or another would take the habit as Lay Brother. We read of a certain William Brant, 'a Laic of our household, but a Clerk in regard to learning,' who joined the convent at fifteen, and lived with them nearly sixty years.

'Although he was notable for knowledge, yet he desired to continue humbly, modestly, and in quietness unto his life's end in the condition of a Laic, and specially to avoid the sin of detraction. Beside his unceasing labours in other matters, he awakened the Brothers for Prime during forty years.'<sup>1</sup>

Another died of the plague after twenty-five years' religious service, 'being employed in the brewery . . . a strong man of great stature, and a pattern to the Laics by reason of his habit of silence and his regularity in frequenting the church.' On the next day died of the same plague a Brother of a different character, after nine years of religious life.

'By nature he was very timid and modest, and at the beginning of his conversion he had suffered many temptations to cowardice, albeit he was afterwards delivered from these by the grace of God. So he yearned for death with great desire, longing to be released and to be with Christ, and he was laid in the eastern cloister.'<sup>2</sup>

The last entry by the hand of Thomas à Kempis runs as follows :

☞ 'In the year of our Lord 1471, on the feast day of Antony the Confessor, in the morning after High Mass, died that devout Laic, Gerlac son of John. . . . He was seventy-two years old, and

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicles*, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 146-7.

for the last fifty-three years and more had lived with us in great humility, simplicity, and patience. He bore many toils and privations, and amongst the other virtues that he showed, he was especially notable for the virtue of silence. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The Chronicle, taken up by another hand, continues :

' In the same year (1471), on the feast of St. James the Less, and after Compline, died our most beloved Brother Thomas Hemerken, who was born in the city of Kempen, in the diocese of Cologne. He was in the ninety-second year of his age, and this was the sixty-third year after his investiture ; likewise he had been a priest for above fifty-seven years.

' In the days of his youth he was an hearer of Florentius at Deventer, by whom also he was sent, when twenty years old, to his own brother, who at that time was Prior of Mount St. Agnes. From this same brother he received his investiture after six years of probation, and from the early days of the monastery he endured great poverty and many labours and temptations.

' Moreover, he wrote that complete copy of the Bible which we use, and also many other books for the use of the House, and for sale. Likewise he composed divers little books for the edification of the young, which books were plain and simple in style, but mighty in the matter thereof and in their effectual operation.

' The thought of the Lord's passion filled his heart with love, and he was wondrous comfortable to the troubled and the tempted ; but as age grew upon him he was vexed with a dropsy in the legs, and so fell asleep in the Lord and was buried in the eastern cloister by the side of Brother Peter Herbort.'<sup>2</sup>

So the fair beginning of a specially hidden life, just to be traced in the book of *The Founders of the New Devotion*, is linked, in the book of *The Chronicles of Mount St. Agnes*, to an end worthy of the man whom the gratitude of all the Churches honours among the perfected. We remember the thrill of the awed schoolboy and chorister singing in the choir at Deventer as he felt the hand of the saint, his master, Florentius, resting on his shoulder ; we have seen how he drank in the spirit of that revival from the lives of the Brethren of the Common Life, who made a home for

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicles*, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 143-4.



him and guarded his youth. Now he is very old, and, having written his recollections of the dawn and progress of the movement, he dies and is buried. The younger chronicler who takes up his pen has little to say of their late aged Master of the Novices, but that he copied the Bible which the convent uses; that his heart was filled with the love of our Saviour; that he was ever a comforter of all who were in trouble or temptation; and that he was from youth to old age 'our most beloved Brother Thomas'—yes, and that he also wrote some little books for simple people, 'plain in style, mighty in the matter'! How intimately, after four hundred years, we know the names of some of those 'little books' which were not thought to deserve particular mention—*Of the Imitation of Christ, Of the Ecclesiastical Music, Admonitions concerning Inward Things, Of Internal Consolation, Concerning the Communion*.<sup>1</sup> The younger scribe had no need to apologize to a more accomplished age for the simple style of 'our beloved Brother Thomas.' His praise is secure; for those 'little books' remain with us, and are still 'mighty in effectual operation,' and through them the humble and hidden writer is still 'wondrous comfortable to the troubled and the tempted' in every generation.<sup>2</sup> Thanks to Thomas of Kempen, *The New Devotion* does not grow obsolete; but, as the world's burden and sorrow increase, continues to refresh the roots of all truest thought and aspiration. We are deeply grateful to the translator who has brought within the reach of many two more of the 'little books' which enshrine it.

<sup>1</sup> A little volume of *Prayer and Meditations on the Life of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, translated by Dr. Duthoit (Kegan Paul, 1904), was reviewed in the article on 'Books of Devotion' (*C.Q.R.*, Jan. 1905).

<sup>2</sup> 'Except the New Testament no book of religious thought has been used so widely and so long: 2,000 Latin editions, 1,000 French; translations French, Italian, English; and we are translating still. No book of human composition has been the companion of so many serious hours, has nerved and comforted so many and such different minds—preacher and soldier and solitary thinker, Christian or even, it may be, one unable to believe.'—Dean Church, referring to the *Imitation of Christ* in his *Discipline of the Christian Character*.

## ART. V.—THE MOZARABIC RITE.

1. *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica*. Vol. V. *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église Wisigothique et Mozarabe d'Espagne du cinquième au onzième siècle*. Publié pour la première fois avec une introduction, des notes, une étude sur neuf calendriers Mozarabes, etc. Par D. MARIUS FÉROTIN, Bénédictin de Farnborough. (Paris, 1904. To be obtained also at S. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough.)
2. *Liturgia Mozarabica secundum regulam Beati Isidori*, in duos tomos divisa, quorum pars prior continet *Missale Mixtum*, praefatione, notis, et appendicibus ab ALEXANDRO LESLEO, S. J. sacerdote, ornatum; posterior *Breviarium Gothicum*, opera FR. ANT. LORENZANA, Toletanae ecclesiae archiepiscopi, recognitum. Nova nunc et accuratiori editione utrumque monumentum reviviscit accurante J. P. MIGNE, . . . editore. [Parisiis], 1862.

THE Order of St. Benedict has always been noted as a home and nursery of learning. All students of ecclesiastical antiquities are in its debt; and now a new series of 'Monumenta' has begun to issue forth from the Abbey of Farnborough (an abbey of the French congregation and peopled by French monks, although it finds a home on English soil) which will lay the student of liturgies under a new obligation. The first volume of this series was the beginning of a collection of all possible references to services and their details in the whole of Christian literature (including inscriptions); and as the volume before us is numbered V., we presume that this grand collection of material—a work which could hardly be accomplished at all except by the collaboration of the members of an Order—will be continued through volumes II. to IV., the publication of which we await with lively anticipation. We offer our congratulations to the Fathers of Farnborough on the commencement of their arduous task, and in particular to Abbot Cabrol and Dom H. Leclercq, upon whom falls the labour of the general editorship of the series.

The volume before us offers one of those delightful surprises of which we have experienced several in recent years. Again and again have attempts been made to rediscover some of the surviving MSS. of the Mozarabic Rite, and time after time have those attempts been baffled, although tantalizing accounts of such MSS. could be read in the works of liturgical scholars of the seventeenth century. Above all it seemed too much to hope that any MS. of the services corresponding to those contained in the ordinary Ritual and Pontifical would be likely to turn up, as all trace of such a service-book seemed to have vanished. But the unexpected has happened. Dom Férotin has been fortunate enough to discover two MSS. of this lost and long-forgotten work, one of them of the highest value; and he has now given to the world a magnificent edition of the *Liber Ordinum*, containing the Ritual and Pontifical offices of this ancient rite, together with a very large number of Votive Masses. We hope that other 'voyages liturgiques' of this learned Benedictine may lead to a collation of many MSS. of the Masses and choir services of the rite, on which may be founded a critical edition of the Missal and choir offices.

The Church in Spain has had a singular and chequered history. In the fourth century Catholic Christianity had become the dominant religion in all the more populous centres; but with the fifth century the conquering hordes of Visigoths brought with them an Arian Christianity, without overthrowing the existing religion which they found settled and established. In the latter half of the sixth century the conquerors yielded to the conquered, and, with their king Reccarede, gave their adhesion to the Catholic faith. From this epoch the Church rapidly consolidated itself. A long series of frequent national councils legislated in the interests of the purity of the Church and the unity of its doctrine, government, and ritual; a succession of great men, Isidore, Leander, Ildephonsus, filled the chief sees and regulated its services; and all seemed prosperous until at the beginning of the eighth century the Moors from Africa sailed across the strait, and poured into the

Peninsula. They speedily brought all its fairest provinces beneath their sway, leaving little besides the mountain fastnesses of the Asturias under Christian rule, and reducing the Christians within their newly-founded caliphate of Cordova to the condition of a subject race. It was three hundred years before the Christians of the north could turn the scale of victory so far as to expel the Moorish dynasty from Toledo (in A.D. 1085); and even before Toledo had again become the home of Christian rule, attempts were made to do away with the national rite, to abolish the majestic liturgy which derived its origin from the earliest strata of Christianity in Spain, which had been fostered, guarded, and developed by the long succession of Spanish saints, and was consecrated by centuries of persecution—for an alien rite, which their fathers had not known, but which had become ‘the general use of the Western Church,’ not by any means altogether on its merits, but partly by reason of the magic name of Rome, and also probably in some degree because in that rite the Mass could be got through in a shorter time.

The Romanizing party of that day conducted their campaign in a manner not altogether unknown in later times: they bespattered the national rite with convenient epithets of abuse, regardless of their falsity. The effete old rite was ‘Mozarabic’ (that is, it was of Moorish origin); it was ‘Gothic’ (*i.e.* it was brought in by the Arian conquerors and tainted with their heresy); and an appeal was made to Rome to condemn the rite on account of heretical passages. The result of that appeal is given in the contemporary account quoted by Dom Férotin in a note on p. xix of his Introduction. The Spanish bishops, justly resenting and resisting this unprincipled attack upon the national rite, deputed three of their number to go to Rome, taking with them copies of their service-books, and there to submit them to the inspection of Pope Alexander II. They took with them the *Liber Missarum*, the *Liber Antiphonarum*, the *Liber Orationum*, and the *Liber Ordinum*—it being unnecessary to exhibit the Psalter or the *Liber Comicus* (which completed the liturgical books) as these contained

only the Psalms and Canticles and Scriptural lessons used in the services.<sup>1</sup> The books were perused by the Curia and the Pope himself, and were universally commended and approved. One would think that the accusers might have taken the trouble to read the books themselves before making their reckless accusation; but when the conclusion is foregone and the object is to discover a plausible excuse to support it, it appears to be a common method to launch reckless accusations to deceive the ignorant and to leave the refutation of these false accusations to the few who will take the trouble to investigate the facts. Under such circumstances this ample vindication proved only a respite, and in the year 1089 the king issued a decree abolishing the national rite in favour of the Roman. On the protest of the people and clergy of Toledo, it was agreed that it should be permissible to say either the Roman or Mozarabic Mass in all the ancient churches of the city; and so the rite dragged on a precarious existence, not wholly superseded—

<sup>1</sup> These books were not the later kind of 'mixed' service-books, such as Missals and Breviaries, in which all the different parts of each series of services are mixed or combined in one book; but these were books of the earlier type, each of which contained the parts (often of several services) *said by one person or class of persons*. The *Liber Missarum* probably corresponded to a Roman Sacramentary, and contained the prayers of all Masses, but neither lessons nor antiphons; the *Liber Antiphonarum* (like the Ambrosian MSS.) contained the music of all antiphons and responds used throughout the year at Vespers and Matins as well as Mass; the *Liber Orationum* (like the *Orationale* published by Bianchini) contained the Collects for all services except the Mass; the *Liber Ordinum* contained all the Occasional Offices as well as Ordination services, and a large number of Votive Masses. Dom Férotin gives reasons, on pages xviii, xix of his most full and lucid Introduction, for thinking that the principal MS. of which his book is a reproduction is probably the identical MS. which was taken to Rome and approved by Pope Alexander II. in 1065.

It would seem that the first mixed service-books in Spain were introduced about the tenth century. The British Museum MSS. (Additional MS. 30844-6) are mixed MSS., neither Missals nor Breviaries but a combination of all the secular services—Vespers, Matins, and Mass—for the ecclesiastical year, all the elements of each service being included. An account of the first beginnings of 'mixed' Missals and Breviaries (of the Roman rite as well as of the Ambrosian and Mozarabic) would be very interesting.

as concerns the Mass at least <sup>1</sup>—until Cardinal Ximenes set himself to rescue the dying rite from an unmerited decay. It is well known how he sought out MSS. and from them commissioned Alfonzo Oetiz to edit a Missal, and to complete a Breviary. The first was printed in 1500, and the second in 1502, at Toledo. We may have something to say on a future occasion about these restored service-books, and the services which they exhibit; but will proceed at present to give a short account of the *Liber Ordinum* before us.

The principal MS. of this book is very full and nearly perfect. After a calendar and a few pages of less important items, the MS. contains an elaborate series of forms for the benediction of oil, salt, and water : *Ordo baptismi celebrandus quolibet tempore*, comprising the rites of making a catechumen, *effetatio*, *traditio symboli*, *benedictio fontis*, the interrogations and the actual baptism and confirmation. After the baptismal service we find the ordination prayers for all kinds of orders and functionaries—clerk, sacristan, librarian, sub-deacon, deacon, archdeacon, primicerius, priest, archpriest, and abbat—but none for the usual minor orders nor for the consecration of a bishop, although the MS. was compiled for use in the primatial diocese of Toledo. These are followed by forms for the benediction of virgins, abbesses, and widows. After these ordination services follow forms for the visitation and unction of the sick, for the exorcism of the possessed, several forms for the reconciliation of penitents, Arians, Donatists, and Jews; an elaborate series of forms for death and burial of laics, children, bishops, priests, and virgins. Then forms of service for the king on

<sup>1</sup> The Breviary services as said in the Mozarabic chapel since the printing of the *Breviary* shew clear signs that they are a 'restoration' and not a survival of traditional services. Not only do they include Prime, Tierce, Sexts, Nones and Complin (which are monastic services and no part of the original scheme of secular services), but in Lent (as we are informed) they say a kind of service for Tierce, Sexts, Nones, interpolated with the lessons &c. of the services for the instruction of the Catechumens (*Missae Catechumenorum*) which were appointed for use in the Cathedral at those hours of the day—a totally different class of services altogether.



going forth to battle and on his return, and an elaborate series of benedictions of various utensils and fruits of the earth, &c. After this come a series of special services connected with Holy Week—the blessing of palms and the *traditio symboli* on Palm Sunday; the stripping of the altars and feet-washing on Maundy Thursday; the veneration of the Cross and reconciliation of penitents on Good Friday; the blessing of the lamp and paschal candle, the vigil service, and the order of baptism on Easter Eve. The second part of the *Liber Ordinum* contains Votive Masses and special Ordines (fifty-six in all); but at the end of the *Liber Ordinum* proper is added a supplement (which, however, Dom Férotin thinks was written by the original scribe) containing the very interesting Mozarabic marriage rites (alas! imperfect), and three other items.

In the Appendices Dom Férotin gives us an elaborate study of nine Mozarabic Kalendars which are printed in parallel columns, also essays on the sacring of the Visigothic kings, and the Mozarabic rites of dedication of churches. The work is concluded with four indices, of which the third is a complete index of all the liturgical forms not only in the *Liber Ordinum*, but also in the printed Missal, Breviary, and *Orationale*. This index alone must have been a work of very great labour; it will be of untold value to all future students of the rite, and will lay them under a delightful though heavy obligation. We could wish that the reference had been to the pages of Lesley's *Missal* and Lorenzana's *Breviary* instead of to the columns of Migne's reprints of these books. The originals are rare and Migne's editions are common; but since the original pagination is given in Migne, the index would have been not less useful for Migne's reprints, and would also have been available for the earlier editions. We fear it is too much to ask the makers of indices to take as their model the wonderful index to the Gregorian Antiphonale Missarum made by the Rev. W. H. Frere for the Plainsong Society's edition of the Sarum Gradual.

In the Introduction, writing with a reserve due in part to the difficulty of the subject, and partly to his own



modesty, Dom Férotin discusses the locale and probable antiquity of the services, &c. contained in the various divisions of the *Liber Ordinum*, and shews that a considerable part of the ritual is probably derived from the use of Toledo, and goes back to the latter part of the seventh century. He considers that certain other portions are not later than the sixth century, and that the greater part of the prayers, &c., of the baptismal and ordination services, and of the forms for public penitence, unction of the sick and burial of the dead, the offices of Holy Week, the *Missa omnimoda* and several of the Votive Masses probably date from a time before the invasion of the barbarians in the early part of the fifth century. Of course certain portions of the Ritual are of later date, but Dom Férotin gives a quotation from St. Eugenius of Toledo, shewing that as early as the seventh century the Spanish Church was rich in Votive Masses, and he adduces the improbability of any great literary activity in liturgical composition after the fall of the Visigothic monarchy at the beginning of the eighth century.

The above remarks will shew how great an interest attaches to this service-book, the recovery of which restores to us so large a portion of the ancient rite of the Peninsula. It may be interesting to call attention to certain points and details of the services. The baptismal rites in the shape in which they have been preserved do not shew us the original form in which they were used for the admission of adults as catechumens, their instruction and exorcism in the series of services called 'Scrutinies,' nor the final ceremonies of the baptism in connexion with the Easter Vigil. We have nothing strictly parallel to the exact descriptions of the similar services of the Roman rite which are preserved for us in the *Ordines Romani* and the Gelasian Sacramentary. The forms in the *Liber Ordinum* (*Ordo baptismi celebrandus quolibet tempore*) shew us a later stage in the development of these services, when the normal administration of baptism was to infants, and when it had become detached from the cycle of the Church's year, and was administered at all times and seasons as required.

At this stage (much as in mediæval Rituals) the long series of the original baptismal services had been 'boiled down' into one service, but the principal prayers and formulæ had been retained from the original offices and in their original order, so that even from the later form it is still possible to trace to a great extent the general course of the original services. The Mozarabic service begins with what was originally the admission of a catechumen—the exsufflation and the sign of the cross, but without imposition of hands at this point. The 'Scrutinies,' or services of instruction for the catechumens, are not represented, but we shall endeavour hereafter to call attention to the fact that in the Mozarabic Breviary and Missal (and the *Orationale* so far as concerns the prayers) we have a singularly full and complete series of these services of instruction,<sup>1</sup> of a type quite other than the Scrutinies of the Roman rite, but bearing a close resemblance to the ancient Ambrosian series (one half of which are still said in the Cathedral at Milan, as they were in the days of St. Ambrose) and also to the services used at Jerusalem in the fourth century and the relics of the similar services enshrined in the Byzantine rite of the present day. After the making of a catechumen in the *Liber Ordinum* there follows the *Efzetatio*, with its solemn exorcism of the devil and the unction of the competent, the blessing with the imposition of hands, and the 'tradition' of the Creed. (All this took place originally on Palm Sunday, the *Efzetatio* at Matins [*i.e.* Lauds], the 'tradition' of the Creed during the Mass.) Then the exorcism and blessing of the font, the interrogations (both of renunciation and faith), the baptism, confirmation, vesting with the white robe, and communion.

Here are found several points worthy of note. (1) There is no 'sacrament of salt' among the ceremonies of the catechumenate, and Dom Férotin seems to shew conclusively that it is a mistake to suppose that this was a Spanish

<sup>1</sup> These services of instruction (*Missæ Catechumenorum*) seem to be distinct from the actual 'Scrutinies.' In the Ambrosian rite the 'Scrutinies' were held on Saturdays, and the services of instruction on all other week days in Lent.

custom, and that in reality it is distinctly Roman. We would suggest the possibility that the *Effetatio* (or at least the known form of it) is also an importation from the Roman rite, though an early one; our reasons being (a) that the rite has a very special and individual character not likely to have arisen independently at different centres, (b) that the accompanying formulæ in the Roman and Mozarabic rites seem identical in origin, and (c) that its taking place at a service such as Lauds gives it the air of a later addition to a complete series of services, already existing, for which a new position had to be found. The true rite of the 'tradition' of the Creed would be out of place in an *ordo baptismi quolibet tempore*; it is given in the services for Palm Sunday for use at the Mass,<sup>1</sup> and is here replaced by an interrogative Creed, differing from the original interrogations which follow just before the actual baptism. The latter are as follows:

Credis N. in Dominum Patrem omnipotentem? R. Credo.

Et in Jhesum Christum filium ejus unicum., Deum et Dominum nostrum? R. Credo.

Et in Spiritu Sancto? R. Credo.

These are preceded by three Renunciations and the question 'Quis vocaris?' R. N. (The name had previously been given when the child was made a catechumen.) It is interesting to remark that the first series of interrogations run in the third person: '*Credit N. in Dominum Patrem omnipotentem?*' &c. (one MS. *Credet*); and that the answers to the second series and the renunciation questions run also in the third person in two MSS.: '*Abrenunciat hic famulus Dei diabolo et angelis ejus?*' R. *Abrenunciat. Credit N. in Dominum Patrem omnipotentem?* R. *Credet*, etc.

The baptism is conferred by a single immersion, and with the characteristic Gallican addition '*ut habeas vitam aeternam*' to the usual baptismal formula. After the baptism the child is immediately confirmed by the priest, who signs him with chrism and then lays his hand on him

<sup>1</sup> In the Missal the 'tradition' takes place after the *Psallendum* and before the Epistle; in the *Liber Ordinum* it is assigned to the usual place of the sermon after the Gospel.

with a prayer for the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit,<sup>1</sup> founded on Isaiah xi., but otherwise quite different from the Roman prayer. The neophyte is then vested in a white robe and receives the Holy Communion. We note with pleasure the unmistakable survival of the laying on of hands in the Spanish rite of Confirmation; and the single chrismation helps to support the belief that the baptismal chrismation by the priest in the Roman rite (distinct from the subsequent chrismation by the bishop) is really a duplication of the original single chrismation, and that the Roman rite also had originally a single chrismation by the bishop—the double chrismation having arisen when Holy Baptism began to be administered by priests and they were allowed so far to copy the bishop as to bestow a chrismation, although the actual chrismation which accompanied the laying on of hands was reserved to the bishop. Dom Férotin has one of his concise and useful notes on the custom of priests administering Confirmation: it would be interesting if we had some evidence as to the actual practice of the Spanish Church in later times. We suppose that the evidence of the MS. may be accepted as conclusive evidence of the survival of the custom down to the middle of the eleventh century.

In the directions for the communion of the newly-baptized (and confirmed) infant we find enshrined the Mozarabic words of administration of Holy Communion as follows:—'*Corpus Domini nostri Jhesu Christi sit salvatio tua*'; and for the chalice, '*Sanguis Christi maneat tecum redemptio tua*.' These are to be found again, with one very slight alteration, mixed up with the prayers at placing the elements on the altar before the beginning of the Mass, in the *Missa omnimoda* as given in MS. A, to which we shall presently return. (Communion in both kinds, at least as the normal rule, survived everywhere as late as the date of this MS., it is supposed.)

This would appear the most natural place for the rites of marriage; but these were not part of the original MSS., and find a place only in an Appendix—one, however, which

<sup>1</sup> A different and very lengthy prayer is given for use at the Easter Vigil in place of the other.

as we have seen, Dom Férotin thinks was very possibly written by the original scribe, Bartholomew the priest. Though of considerable interest, they are unfortunately imperfect. The part remaining begins at the end of Matins, and it is very possible that the form of taking one another for husband and wife and vowing fidelity, with corresponding questions, may have preceded Matins or even Vespers on the previous evening, and the whole have been included in the last leaves of the MS. After Matins comes the blessing and exchange of the rings. At the end of the Mass (which is to follow here), and before the dismissal, the bride and bridegroom approach the screen or rails and the girl is handed over to the priest, who veils her. The pair being placed under the canopy, the priest blesses them both and the bride separately, and gives her to the man, afterwards communicating them both.

The *Ordo ad visitandum et unguendum infirmum* is by no means an office for the dying; the main object of the unction is evidently the cure of the patient, and the healing of the diseases of the soul is connected and parallelized with the healing of the infirmities of the body.

The very elaborate forms of burial are curious; many expressions in the prayers are very rich and beautiful. Only here and there are to be found any expressions which could possibly imply penal torment, and most of the language seems only too much in the other direction and more suited for a departed saint than for an ordinary sinful Christian.

Dom Férotin thinks it very possible that the service for the Blessing and Procession of Palms (including a procession from one church to another) may date from the seventh century and be the oldest surviving form of the service. All the special services for Holy Week shew considerable differences from even the original Gothic portions of the forms of these services remaining in the Missal—e.g. the Penitential Reconciliation on Good Friday is much shorter than that given in the Missal (and ably described by Mgr. Duchesne in *Origines du Culte Chrétien*), and seems to be plainly an abbreviated form—and it appears

to us that in several points the Gothic original underlying the corresponding portion of the Missal is the more authentic. The form of the *orationes solemnes* which are intercalated between the lessons at the Easter Vigil, as given in the Missal, is, however, very inferior to that of the *Liber Ordinum* and the *Orationale Gothicum*. For the actual blessing of the font and the baptismal service at the Vigil we are unfortunately referred to the *Ordo baptismi quolibet tempore*.

The second part of the *Liber Ordinum* consists of a large number of Votive Masses—indeed we should imagine it a veritable *embarras de richesses*. We must pass over these, but at the beginning of this part, after the Roman Order of the Mass (unfortunately imperfect at the beginning), is given the Mozarabic *Ordo Missae omnimodae*, which is of great interest, since it is the Mozarabic equivalent to the Ordinary and Canon of the Roman Mass,<sup>1</sup> with typical chants and lessons included to shew the full order of the service. The consideration of the many problems arising out of this Order of the Mass involves a general discussion of the Mozarabic Mass, a subject of great interest to which we hope to return.

<sup>1</sup> It is instructive to compare this version of the *Missa votiva omnimoda* with the corresponding Masses in the printed Mozarabic Missal (p. 441, col. 982) and in the *Sacramentarium Bobiense* (p. 359) to see with what freedom these authorities edited the text of their Masses. In the *Liber Ordinum* a private prayer (*Apologia*) is inserted before the Introit. The 'Missa' is really an *Apologia* also, though here put in place of the *Oratio admonitionis ad populum*. After this follows a form of the *Ectene* (without *Agyos*), the *Oratio alia*: then a form of the *Nomina* in dire confusion, some lines, '*Gloriose Virginis . . . martirum*,' having been transferred from their right position after '*facientes commemorationem*.' (It is worth noting that special clauses are provided in the *Nomina* for insertion when required.) The account of the institution of the Eucharist offers some very interesting variants. The interpolation '*Adesto, adesto, Jesu bone pontifex*,' found in the Missal before the words of institution, is absent, and several small liturgical forms are preserved. The description of the 'seven prayers' from the well-known passage in St. Isidore *De Officiis*, lib. i. cap. 15, is given in the margin of the MS., not always exactly opposite the prayers described. We would note that the fifth prayer, called *Illatio*, appears to include the *post sanctus* and words of institution, and is spoken of as a *thanksgiving*.



## ART. VI.—THE BEGINNINGS OF BRITAIN AND GAUL.

1. *The History of England from the Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest.* By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. 'Political History of England, Vol. I.' (London: Longmans, 1906.)
2. *Histoire de France. Tome premier. Les origines: la Gaule indépendante et la Gaule romaine.* Par G. BLOCH. (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1900.)
3. *Kultur der alten Kelten und Germanen.* Von GEORG GRUPP. (München: Allgemeine Verlagsgesellschaft, 1905.)
4. *Waldbäume und Kultur-pflanzen im germanischen Altertum.* Von J. HOOPS. (Strassburg: Trübner, 1905.)
5. *Formation de la Nation française.* Par GABRIEL DE MORTILLET. (Paris: Alcan, 1900.)

THE beginnings of the written history of Britain date from that great historic landmark when Rome's influence first touched the land. It was a time when the links, once geographical, which bound Britain to the continent of Europe were still strong, and when the races who inhabited the island had still a kinship that could be recognized to the men across the narrow strait. But the beginnings of history are far less clear in Britain than in Gaul. We have no statement so simple, as to our own land, as that with which the *Gaullic War* begins.

'Gaul as a whole is divided into three parts, one of which is inhabited by the Belgae, another by the Aquitani, and the third by the people who call themselves Celtae and whom we call Galli. These peoples differ one from another in language, institutions and laws. The Galli are separated from the Aquitani by the Garonne and from the Belgae by the Marne and the Seine.'

From those clear words of the great soldier and writer and statesman it might be possible to start a history of mediæval France. But Caesar told nothing of the earlier days from which the peoples whom he knew took their beginnings. It is back into these dim prehistoric recesses that we must trace the origin of the great homogeneous



kingdom which was compounded of elements so diverse. For the peoples of whom Caesar wrote were not primitive races : they were already mixed ; and we must go behind the documentary, and even the linguistic, evidence to the combined results of palaeontology and anthropology.

Before them both stands geology ; but geology, when the Tertiary system of rock-foundation is reached, and through that the Pleistocene period comes into being, yields its interest to the evidence of the existence of man, pre-historic but certain. Palaeolithic man has left his handiwork in many European lands, in Britain, and more notably still in Gaul.<sup>1</sup>

We go back, then, to ages of which only geology can give evidence : we trace the existence of gigantic animals : we find rude traces of work which must have been wrought by man—depicting in stone the monsters among whom he lived. Among these it is possible to discover progress. A definite stage is identified in what is known as the Magdalen series of sculptures, found in the Cave of the Magdalen, in the Dordogne. Then, as to man himself : the skulls found

<sup>1</sup> For authorities on the early history of Gaul and on pre-historic Gaul the short lists of books appended by M. Bloch to each section of his work may be consulted ; but it may be well to note that the ancient texts are collected in Bouquet's *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, and are well summarized in Gabriel de Mortillet, *Formation de la Nation française* (2nd ed. 1900). See also *Dictionnaire archéologique de la Gaule* (begun in 1867, incomplete) ; Salomon Reinach, *Description raisonnée du Musée de Saint-Germain*, i. 1899. The catalogues of many local Musées contain important information, especially those of Nîmes and Arles, etc. Among modern books, Cartailhac, *La France pré-historique*, 1889 ; Bloch, *La Gaule avant les Gaulois*, 1891 ; Bertrand, *La Religion des Gaulois*, 1897 ; D'Arbois de Jubainville, criticism of the last-named, in *Revue celtique*, xix. 70 sqq., Bloch, *La Religion des Gaulois*, in *Revue internationale de Penseignement*, xxix. 533, xxx. 145 ; G. von Humboldt, *Prüfung der Untersuchungen über die Urbewohner Hispaniens vermittelt der baskischen Sprache*, 1821. This work was the parent of a long controversy upon which there is a literature still growing ; see Luchaire, *Les Origines linguistiques de l'Aquitaine*, 1877, and (as on all other subjects connected with this period) T. Rice Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 1899 ; Molière, *Introduction à l'histoire des Gaulois, proto-Celtés et Galates*, a critical study of recent work, with additions, 1890.

in the Neandertal are our earliest evidence, apart from the rudely sculptured work of man, of what man was. They shew a race dolichocephalic, long-headed and of low forehead.<sup>1</sup> A transition type of skull has been found at Langerie-Basse in the department of Dordogne, another at Chancelade not far away, and others in the same district. At first sight wholly different from the Neandertal remains, the Langerie relics yield on close investigation some similar characteristics. Do they belong to a new race, and represent a later invasion of Europe, or are they a development from what is certainly the earlier, less human, type of Neandertal? It is most probable that the latter alternative is the true one. The next step is reached in a grotto in Périgord, at Cro-Magnon, whence come remains of a race still dolichocephalic, but much more advanced. Till then we have been among remains of the Palaeolithic Age. With Cro-Magnon it would seem that we approach the beginning of the Neolithic Age, or at least more certainly in the remains found in the grottoes of Baumes-Chaudes, in the department of Lozère, and in the cavern of L'Homme Mort in the same district. Here are mesocephalic skulls; and the men to whom they belonged were small, long-headed and probably weak.

This is the first page, say the anthropologists, of French history.

A second page comes with the discoveries of Grenelle, where skulls are approaching the brachycephalic type, belonging to men whose stature hardly exceeded five feet three inches. A type not greatly dissimilar has been found in the basin of the Meuse, and is known as the Furfooz race. These belong to the later Neolithic Age. It is possible that they may have lived at the same time as another dolichocephalic race, who have left remains on Cape Blanc Nez. Much of this is the subject of warm contest, most is still open to discussion; but at least we may conclude that three races existed. All were cave-dwellers and probably cannibals; and they certainly had a life of hard contest among the prodigious animals of their time.

<sup>1</sup> G. Grupp, *Kultur d. alten Kelten etc.*, p. 2, argues that the skulls are not ape-like.

They had, however, developed a rough art of design. Civilization had begun.

At this stage of the record comes in the very interesting evidence collected by Professor Hoops of Heidelberg on the forest trees and the cultivated plants of ancient Europe. Dealing chiefly with Germany, though what he says also affects Gaul, he traces the changes in the forest flora of Europe since the Ice Age, enumerates the forest flora of the Stone Age and describes the forests and the steppe in their relations to pre-historic settlement.

Side by side with this evidence we may place the gigantic dolmens which are found in so many parts of modern France, as in Northern lands and the British Isles. They fall into two groups, those of the coast of the Ocean, and of the mid and southern inland. But any certain conclusions as to their age are hardly to be drawn. They contain implements of bronze, and jewels of turquoise and jade. Their geographical distribution would seem to shew that a wave of conquest and colonization spread over the land from the north. It has been argued that the fact that no dolmens are to be found in Gaul beyond the Jura and the Vosges may be explained by the effects of atmospheric action and the use of ancient monuments for building purposes; but this is hardly an argument of much value. It may, however, be concluded that at the time when these huge monuments were erected there were dwelling in Gaul men of different races and types. The dominant type, it may well be, were the dark round-headed folk who form so large a proportion of the French population to-day.

A later stage—and here the controversy becomes more bitter—is marked by the appearance of a people known to ancient writers as the Iberians, whose tongue is represented in existing inscriptions, and also survives, at least in part, in Basque. They were short and dark and dolichocephalic. They occupied the country between the Rhône and the Pyrenees, and perhaps part of what came to be known as Aquitania. Mixed with these, to the west of the Rhône, were a race called Ligurians by the ancients, and between the

Maritime Alps and the Rhône they were supreme. They were short, dark men, and in the words of one modern writer, 'moderately brachycephalic.' These Ligurians had doubtless followed and conquered the Iberians; and like them they have left many place-names scattered over the departments which form the basin of the Rhône, while some inscriptions in the South of Gaul have been attributed to them which would shew their language to belong to the Aryan stock. They survived later on the coast of the Gulf of Genoa; but before the eighth century B.C. they had been subjugated in Gaul by a new and stronger race.

Before this occurred, a colony had settled in the South which was to bring the land into connexion with the civilized East of Europe. Phenician explorers, traders and colonists, had long navigated the whole of the Mediterranean. It is possible that they may have landed on the shores of the Ligurian possessions earlier than the Greeks: inscriptions found at Marseilles and Avignon may be interpreted as evidence. But it is certain that about 600 B.C. a Phocian colony had founded the city of Massilia (now Marseilles), and that this was reinvigorated by a new arrival of men of the same race about 537. In the South of France and on the coast Greek inscriptions abound, and, though little is known of the history of the colonies, it is clear that their influence was great. Strabo describes the greatness of Massilia, the city which stretched inland from the great rock the glittering angel of whose church now attracts the gaze from far out at sea.

With the decadence of Tyre came the expansion of Greece; and of that expansion Massilia was a striking example. For fifty years the history of the city is buried in silence, but we know that it grew in military strength and in commercial importance. With the following century it took its part in the naval war against Carthage, and Thucydides mentions the victories of its hardy sailors. These successes marked the beginning of 'the great age' of Marseilles. The Carthaginians and the Etruscans were no longer its rivals. It was allied with Rome. In the sixth century before Christ it spread its colonies over the

Mediterranean littoral, and within its walls it was one of the grandest and largest cities of the time.

'Des hauteurs où s'étagé le vieux Marseille et où se dressait l'acropole, elle descendait par masses serrées sur le Lacydon, le vieux port d'aujourd'hui. Il était alors un des plus vastes du monde et des mieux garantis par la nature et par l'art. Les chantiers, les arsenaux qui le bordaient étaient renommés. En peuple pratique, les Massaliotes avaient réservé tout leur luxe pour ce genre de constructions. Ils ne semblent pas s'être mis en frais pour le reste. Le maisons particulières furent bâties en bois et en chaume jusqu'à la domination romaine. Les seuls temples mentionnés par Strabon sont ceux d'Artémis et d'Apollon. Il subsiste quelques morceaux de sculpture, intéressants par leur caractère, leur date et leur provenance. Une Aphrodite archaïque, conservée au musée de Lyon, trahit par sa facture la main de l'école ionienne, vers le milieu du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. A la même époque appartient toute une série de stèles, au nombre de quarante-sept. On a remarqué la ressemblance de ces statues avec celles qui décoraient la voie sacrée des Branchides, à Didyme en Asie Mineure, et avec d'autres œuvres analogues trouvées à Cyme, dans la même contrée. Le plus curieux, c'est qu'à en juger par le calcaire où elles sont taillées, les stèles marseillaises semblent elles-mêmes importées de la mère patrie.'<sup>1</sup>

So M. Bloch sums up the position and the art of Marseilles. But if it was not original in art, it was famous for its work in geographical discovery, and also for its political constitution in which neither tyranny nor democracy had place. Political rights belonged to the families which had founded the city. Revolutions there were in the constitution, but these had meant merely the yielding of their power by the nobility of birth to a body of some six hundred men, above which was a council of fifteen, above that again a triumvirate whose members were in turn chief magistrate. This constitution lasted for more than a century after the Roman conquest, and it was not without its influence on the development of the whole of the South.

For Marseilles was no isolated city-colony. On either side it extended its trade, its influence, its conquests. The

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de France*, i. 18.

men of Marseilles were hardy, able, and ambitious : where they went, there they conquered and settled. On the coast they settled where are now Nice, Agde, Antibes, and along a narrow strip between the mountains and the sea. Inland the territory of Massilia stretched to include the cities which are now Arles, Avignon, and Cavaillon. The colonists entered into relations of commerce and of marriage with those whose lands they had overrun. They introduced something of their own Greek culture and their religion ; they planted in the south the olive and the vine. With the great city of Nîmes (as it came later to be called) the greater city of Massilia had constant intercourse. Medals and inscriptions found at Nîmes record the influence of the Greek colony. But still more important in its issues was the close association of Massilia with the Roman State. The colony had been allied with Rome against Carthage, and when the time came the help was not forgotten.

But before this there was a new influx from the East, and a great wave of conquest which had already swept over what are now Germany, England, Ireland, Spain, Italy, Greece. Perhaps as early as the eighth century B.C. the Celts crossed the Rhine : certainly in the second they penetrated to the basin of the Rhône. They mingled with the descendants of the palaeolithic and the neolithic races. They settled down peaceably, and then they began to look about for conquest outside the border of the land they had easily occupied.

At this point, when we come into touch with Caesar's historical description, we may turn aside for a while from the history of Gaul and look across what was now the Channel to trace the beginnings of life on our own island.

Here, within the last year, English readers have had the immense advantage of having the tale told by Dr. Hodgkin, whose learning and facility have never been shewn to greater advantage than in the volume on early British and English History, which he has contributed to the series edited by Dr. William Hunt and Dr. R. L.



Poole.<sup>1</sup> We cannot do better than follow the course of 'pre-historic history' as it is sketched by him.

In the South Devonshire caverns were found some sixty years ago traces of the handicraft of Palaeolithic man; and elsewhere in the deposits of ancient rivers are often found the spearheads, flints, scrapers, and other large stone implements of the same age. Then

'At some time or other after that when the hyena howled in the Brixham Cave, and when Palaeolithic man left there his rudely worked flint implements, the conditions of life in Northern Europe changed. The Arctic zone invaded the larger part of the Temperate zone, and a great cap of ice covered not only the Scandinavian countries and the greater part of Russia but Ireland, Scotland and England, at least as far south as the valley of the Thames. Now were our chalk hills rounded into smoothness, now were many of our river beds hollowed out, and untidy heaps of "terminal moraine" deposited where the glaciers debouched into the valleys. This dismal change, destructive of all the higher organic life and continuing possibly over a period of thousands of years, makes, in our island at any rate, an impassable barrier between two races of mankind. When the great ice deluge subsided, when the winter-tyrant returned to his true Arctic home, when the oak and the pine began again to appear upon the hills, and flowers like our own bloomed in the valleys, then the Neolithic man, the "New Stone-Worker," came upon the scene and scattered abundant evidences of his presence over the land. From that period—date we cannot call it, for we have no evidence which would justify us in making the roughest approximation to a date—man has been continuously a dweller in this island, Neolithic man at length yielding ground to the immigrant Celt, the Celt to the Saxon, the Saxon to the Dane and the Norman.'<sup>2</sup>

With what races have we now to deal? The Neolithic

<sup>1</sup> Up to the time of the Roman conquest we have the Greek writers Strabo and Ptolemy, the Latin Pliny and Tacitus, besides Caesar himself. The information of the first three is scanty indeed. For prehistoric man in Britain see Boyd Dawkins, *Early Man in Britain*; Beddoe, *The Races of Britain*; Greenwell and Rolleston, *British Barrows*; Rhys, *Early Ethnology of the British Isles*; Lockyer, *Stonehenge and other British Stone Monuments*.

<sup>2</sup> *History of England to the Norman Conquest*, p. 3.



men were short ; the skeletons of their Age found in barrows have never exceeded five feet nine inches. They were, it seems fairly certain, non-Aryan. But, as Dr. Hodgkin well says,

' any name which we may for purposes of convenience give to these aborigines of Britain, whether the now nearly discarded word Turanians, to mark their exclusion from the Aryan family ; or Iberians, to indicate a possible connexion with the mysterious Basques of the Pyrenees ; or Silurians, in order to show a possible survival of their type in the countrymen of Caractacus ; is only like an algebraical symbol, a label affixed to a locked box, denoting our ignorance of its contents.' <sup>1</sup>

In the vast period of time with which the name of Neolithic man is associated there are two stages which have recently been distinguished. The earlier has been called the Hill-period, the later the Plain-period. Of the first the survivals are earthworks, of the latter the dolmens, and circles, and temples which fifty years ago used to be ascribed to 'the Druids.' In the first period the aim of man was to dwell secure from the dangers which he associated with the flat country, among mountains or hills at an elevation which he could protect or fortify, and where he could preserve his herds from the devastation of the hordes of wild beasts which lived in the plains and valleys below. 'The foe' which man then chiefly dreaded was, it has recently been shewn, 'the wolf.'<sup>2</sup> From him man fled to the uplands, and to prevent his following, the bases of the hills were protected with infinity of labour. The 'shepherd's steps' were made, the dewponds were dug, and naturally fortified places were made at once accessible and impregnable. The ways by which the herds ascended to their night-shelter, the cuttings and trenches, the embank-

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> See the interesting article on 'Prehistoric Man on the Downs,' by A. J. Hubbard, M.D., and G. Hubbard, F.S.A. in the *Cornhill Magazine*, May 1906 ; and for the whole subject see the important book by the same authors, *Neolithic Dewponds and Cattleways*, 1905. On all this Dr. Grupp's book gives very interesting points of comparison.

ments and enclosures, remain over a large part of England as the memorials of those pre-historic times.

The second period of the Neolithic Age, the Plain-period, is that during which earthworks became insignificant and stonework is the stupendous fact. This is the age of Avebury and Stonehenge, of vast sun temples upon the plains. The first is made of unshaped stones, and is surrounded by immense earthworks, which are clearly no longer defensive. The second is of shaped stones, evidently worked, though with no signs of metal implements, and it may now be dated quite a thousand years before the coming of the Celts, and 'within two hundred years of either side of B.C. 1800.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus the dolmens link Neolithic man in Britain to Neolithic man in Gaul. And so do the long mounds, which have come to be called 'long barrows' in which the remains of their dead are found. Those in Britain bear a striking resemblance not only to the earliest ones in Gaul (see above, p. 127) but also to those sketched and described so clearly by Dr. Gabriel Grupp in the Introduction to his valuable book on the *Culture of the Celts and Germans*.<sup>2</sup> An admirable sketch of a 'Nordisches Hockergrab' shews what is found also in our own land. The men of the Stone Age were dolichocephalic, like the men of Cro-Magnon in Périgord. They were followed by men who built circular mounds, whose skulls were brachycephalic, and who were workers in bronze. The Age of Stone had passed into the Age of Metals. The Age of Iron followed the Age of Bronze, and both, in Britain, were the days of Celtic immigration and Celtic rule.

The first question which arises is, Whence did the Celts come?

The question has given rise to a lengthy controversy,

<sup>1</sup> We owe this to Sir Norman Lockyer's book, *Stonehenge*, which is based on a study of the ancient astronomical methods. Dr. Hodgkin thinks it 'possible that Stonehenge may be the "magnificent circular temple to Apollo," which, according to Diodorus Siculus, existed in an island which may be identified with Britain.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 22-23.

which a few years ago was a very familiar one. It is unnecessary here to reopen the discussion: we will rather give a summary view of the conclusion which recent writers, after a very full investigation, have reached. The Celts belong undoubtedly to the Indo-European (or, as Teutonic scholars prefer to call it, the Indo-Germanic) family. And, for their first known home, says M. Bloch: <sup>1</sup>

'Les anciens Grecs plaçaient au delà des monts Ripées, où Borée, le vent du nord, prend son élan (Πτερί), le peuple fabuleux des *Hyperboréens*. Ce mythe prit un corps quand à l'âge de l'invention poétique eut succédé celui de la prose. Le pays idéal se localisa dans le monde réel et une nationalité authentique s'y détacha. Les monts Ripées devinrent le système montagneux de l'Europe centrale. Les Hyperboréens devinrent les Celtes: un historien du milieu du iv<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C., Hécateé de Pont, appelle encore de ce nom les Celtes ou Gaulois qui prirent Rome en 390. C'est donc bien dans les contrées attribuées aux Hyperboréens qu'il faut chercher la primitive Celtique.'

Dr. Hoops <sup>2</sup> points out that the 'Indo-Germanic' tree-names, at first thought to consist only of birch and willow, include also the oak—the presence of which excludes Asia from our consideration—some conifers, the ash, the poplar, the beech and the yew. Even more may be identified, but this collection of flora, especially the beech, points to middle Europe, even to a line from Königsberg to Odessa, as the home of the Indo-Germanic people before their separation into European and Asiatic families.

Again, <sup>3</sup> as the Indo-Germans had no cultivated plants except cereals—wheat, barley, and millet—the circum-Alpine region cannot have formed part of their home. Thus the Neolithic Lake-dwellers cannot have been Indo-Germans, a conclusion at which we had arrived on other grounds. Barley was the chief cereal among the Indo-Germans, and we should thus expect their land to be one of short summers, such as in Northern Europe. Dr. Hoops then suggests that we should decide upon Germany, especi-

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de France* (ed. Lavissee), tome i. p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Waldbäume und Kulturpflanzen*, chap. 4. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* chap. 9.

ally North Germany, and including Denmark, if the beech can be shewn to have been there in the Stone Age, as the original home of the race. If so, the sea which gave to their languages a common word, *mare, mer, meer*, was the Baltic and North Sea.

To this view, it should be observed, Dr. Gabriel Grupp, approaching the question from another point of view, presents a flat negative. The original home of the Indo-Germans was in West or Central Asia,<sup>1</sup> not in Europe; but on the other hand—though he is an example of the type of German scholar, rare but pugnacious, who delights to defend lost causes and untenable positions<sup>2</sup>—he states a position less disputable when he asserts that in the earliest times it is difficult to distinguish between Teutons and Celts.

‘Aus den indogermanischen Urvölkern lösten sich mit der Zeit Kelten und Germanen ab und traten bedeutsam in der Geschichte auf. In der Vorzeit sind Kelten und Germanen kaum zu unterscheiden, und da die alten Schriftsteller die einen wie die andern als langgewachsen, langköpfig, blond und blauäugig, feurig, aber wenig nachhaltig schildern und ihnen einen gemeinsamen Ursprung zuschreiben, muss ihr Charakter noch unentschieden gewesen sein.’<sup>3</sup>

However this may be, there can be no doubt of the distinction before the land which was to be called Britain was invaded by the Celts. The two waves of conquest, as it is the fashion to call them, represented by the Goidelic and the Brythonic immigrants, were equally separated in marked characteristics from the later Teutonic conquerors. Thus Dr. Hodgkin well sums up what is now generally accepted as to the Celtic conquest of our island.

‘At some period whose date cannot even yet be even approximately conjectured, and from some quarter which we may guess, but can only guess, to have been the north of Germany, a bronze-using race of warriors and hunters, ancestors of the

<sup>1</sup> *Kultur der alten Kelten*, etc. p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> He carries this peculiarity even in matters of language, for he writes ‘*der Bütter*’.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 67.

modern Highlander and Irishman, crossed the sea and established themselves in the island of Britain, or, as it was, perhaps, then called, Albion. Later on, but how many centuries later none can say, another race, kindred but probably hostile, invaded our shores, drove the Gaels or Goidels before them, established themselves in the best parts of the southern portion of the island, and, being themselves called Brythons, gave to the whole land the name by which the Romans called it, Britannia. As we know that iron had been introduced into the country before the arrival of the Romans, we may conjecture that this second Celtic wave consisted of the wielders of weapons of iron, and that this was one cause of their victory over the Goidels. The Brythons, thus settled in the valley of the Thames and above the chalk cliffs of Sussex, were the enemies whom Caesar encountered when he invaded Britain.<sup>1</sup>

At the period when the Romans under Caesar became familiar with the Celts of Gaul and Britain it is possible to arrive at some definite conclusions as to their characteristics, their divisions, the geographical distribution of the different tribes, and the mixture of races which had by this time occurred. The Gaul and the Britain which Caesar saw, and which he looked upon with the eye of a practised observer, were neither of them united in government or homogeneous in race. The evidence of barrows seems conclusive that the pre-Celtic races had survived and mingled with their conquerors, and in Britain the later the period of Celtic rule the more clearly the population was a mixed race, and the type of skull was reverting to the dolichocephalic. So it was also in Gaul: the Celts mingled with those whom they had conquered. Of this more hereafter.

And now we come into touch for the first time with Caesar's description.<sup>2</sup> Between the Garonne and the Marne

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> The chief authorities are Caesar, *B. G.* book vi.; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xvi., xxix., xxx.; Ammianus Marcellinus, xv. 9; Diodorus Siculus, v. 28-31; Lucan, *Pharsalia*, i. 447 *sqq.* Besides those cited above (p. 125), see G. Dottin, *La Religion des Gaulois*, in *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Sept. 1898 (xxxviii. 2); Gaidoz, in *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, v. 428; Reinach, *L'Art plastique en Gaule et le Druidisme*, *Revue celtique*, xi.; Rhys, *Celtic Heathendom*; Fustel de Coulanges, *Nouvelles recherches*.

and the Seine are, he says, those who call themselves Celts, but whom the Romans call Gauls; while Diodorus Siculus about a quarter of a century later says that 'the Celts are the peoples who live beyond Massilia, in the interior of the country, near the Alps and on the north of the Pyrenees. The peoples settled on the north of Celtica and those who inhabit all the countries extending along the Ocean and the Hercynian forest as far as Scythia are termed Gauls.' Other writers add confusion; and modern investigators contend over every fragment of information which they have left us. It is even doubted if the word Celt has really—at this date, at least—any ethnological significance. But, whatever the Celts may have meant originally, we may, after these preliminaries, accept the substantial accuracy of Caesar's description, and go on to discover in the Aquitani a mixed race partly, if not principally, Iberian, and in the Belgae men tall and fair who were in no great way different from the Celts. The Belgae were the least mixed of any of the tribes. Caesar's classification was roughly true; but each of the three great divisions of the people of which he spoke, Galli, Aquitani, Belgae, was the result of an amalgamation of different races, and was composed of many tribes. But where nearly everything is disputed we may yet take for an undisputed conclusion that there was, a century before the beginning of our era, sufficient justification for regarding as a whole the land which Caesar so described, and of which it is our task to trace the history. The country between the Ocean, the Rhine, the Alps, the Mediterranean and the Pyrenees, is that which we now call France. It is that which Caesar called Gaul.

Gaul as a whole, with its primitive, Iberian, and Celtic inhabitants, was in the second century before Christ under the dominance of the Celtic or Gallic nationality. But this nationality was the possession of tribes almost innumerable, and it involved, in the area governed, no unity of language or of political institutions. It is not possible to recover the limits of the possessions of each tribe. By the names of their chief cities we can distribute them with an approach to accuracy; but it is impossible to do more.

In the south were the Helvii, on the right bank of the Rhône, and beyond them the two tribes of Volcae, whose chief cities were respectively Nîmes (Nemausus) and Toulouse (Tolosa). On the left bank of the same river beyond the frontier of the Massilian colony and to the south of the Durance, were the Salluvii, and by the north came the Cavari; then northwards the Vocontii, and beyond them the Allobroges, between the Rhône and the Isère and extending into what is now Switzerland. Going up the course of the Rhône on the right were the Memini, Tricastini, Segovellauni; and again northwards and among the mountains the Caturiges, the Centrones, the Seduni, the Varagri, the Nantuates, and the Uberi. All these were known to the Romans towards the end of the third century B.C., and through them it was that Roman forces first made entry into Gaul. The rest of Gaul comes to our knowledge chiefly through Caesar and his conquest. It is that only of which he speaks as containing the three divisions of Aquitani, Celtae, and Belgae.

The Aquitani included the Consorani, Bigerriones, Iluronenses, Benarnenses, Tarbelli, Tarusates, Aturenses, Sotiates, Elusates, Ausci, Vasates, Convenae. The Celtae or Galli, south of the Seine and the Marne, were, in the district of Bordeaux, the Bituriges, Vivisci, and south east of them the Nitiobriges, then the Cadurci, Gabali, Vellavi, Arverni, Segusiavi, Ambani, Sequani, Tigurini, Helvetii, and going westwards again the Aedui, Bituriges, Lemo-vices, Santones, Pictones, Turonii, Namnetes, Veneti, by the Finistère, the Osisumi, and eastwards of them the Coriosolites and the Redones, the Ambibarii, the Unelli, the Baiocasses, Viducasses, and Sagii, all divisions of the Esvii. Southward again the Aulerci Diablintes and Aulerci Cenomanni, the Carnutes, Senones, Lingones, the Tricasses, Parisii, Aulerci Eburvices, and Lexovii. The Belgae included the Leuci, Remi, Silvanectes, Suessiones, Bellovaci, Viromandui, Atrebates, Ambiani, Morini, Caleti, Vellocasses, Menapii, Nervii, Eburones, Aduatici, Treveri, Mediomatrici.<sup>1</sup> These names are all, excepting those of

<sup>1</sup> This list of names, which requires, of course, a map for its full



the different tribes of the Aquitani, Celtic ; but it is clear that they represent by no means wholly Celtic stocks.

The Celtic conquerors had subjugated, and they had also combined with, the old races : and thus while in the the North we find the Celtic type, tall, light-haired, and fresh coloured, in southern and central France we may still trace the survivals of the union of many races, and prominent among them the Iberian, Ligurian, and even the prehistoric type.

What, then, was the political condition of the strangely mingled peoples with whom Caesar came in contact when he entered upon the period of the Gallic wars ?

The most significant as well as the most important feature of the history of Gaul under the Celtic domination was the utter want of union. Organization there was—something of a social order and of proprietary right, cities, assemblies, a noble class, chiefs or kings, a religion ; but every one of these served, not for combination, but for disruption. The last may perhaps approach to an exception to this general judgement. It must therefore receive the first notice.

The religion of the Gauls is a fascinating but confusing picture. Again and again brilliant sketches have been drawn of it in which striking features are made to stand out in vivid picturesqueness. But the greatest caution is to be observed before we accept any of these pictures as representing historic fact. There is a great dearth of authorities. The classical writers wrote with the passion of a scientific interest which had reached its conclusions before it seriously investigated the facts. They desired to assimilate the religion of the Gauls to their own, to identify the gods of the Celts with those whom they had already adopted from other races into their Pantheon. Lucian, for example, because the Celtic Ogmios had a lion skin and a club, at

elucidation, follows chiefly the conclusions of M. G. Bloch in *Histoire de France* (Lavisse), tome i. pp. 28-31, and in some respects those of Mr. T. Rice Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*. It is not the result of a more exhaustive investigation, but rather of a comparison and reconsideration of the latest conclusions of specialists.

once regards him as identical with Hercules; and three other local Gaulish gods were assimilated to the same divinity of the conquerors. Epigraphy has preserved to us the names of a vast number of Celtic divinities whom the Romans identified with gods of their own: no fewer than thirty-eight, for example, were assimilated in this way to Mars, sixteen to Mercury, and ten to Apollo. Some remained unassimilated, but these were chiefly gods and goddesses of springs and rivers and forests, and tutelary deities of towns. But even here we are hardly upon firm ground; for the age of the votive dedications, and of the monuments which illustrate the mythology of Celtic Gaul is disputed among archæologists. It is doubtful, indeed, if any of the figures preserved can be ascribed to the pre-Roman period. Caesar speaks of simulacra<sup>1</sup> of Mercury; but it is likely that these were the great standing stones or menhirs so common in Gaul, which by their shape resembled the familiar emblems of the Greek Hermes. And the images that remain appear to represent the plastic expression under Roman influence, and with close Roman association, of ideas long held but not expressed, and perhaps, indeed, prohibited, among the Gauls. That there were, however, a large number of Celtic deities is certain.

The characteristic of the mass of Celtic religion was a vast and childlike polytheism. This the Romans, it seems probable, sought, at least in their own minds, to systematize and compress. Caesar, indeed—it is not improbable, with the disdain of a Roman with Greek education for barbarism—concentrated into five types all the diverse divinities of the confusing mythology of the Gauls.<sup>2</sup> Still beautiful superstitions lingered about the courses of the rivers, the founts and waterfalls. Nîmes is believed to take its name from Nemausus, the tutelary genius of the flowing waters round which later ages have planted beautiful gardens, and by which still stands the ruined temple of the spirit of the hot springs whom the Romans identified with Diana.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Reinach in *Revue celtique*, xi. 224.

<sup>2</sup> This is the view of M. A. Bertrand, *La Religion des Gaulois* pp. 320-21

Everywhere these local worships lingered on beyond the era of Rome's conquest, of Frankish subjugation and of Christian conversion. Gregory of Tours bears witness to their persistence, and to the active animosity of the Church which was directed against them. Trees, and the misletoe, were even more important objects of veneration. All this, it is most probable, had its roots in pre-Celtic times, and the ceremonies of the fire of St. John (as the Christians called it) and the Yule-log, connected, perhaps, but by no means certainly, with sun-worship and with the introduction of burning instead of burying the dead, had also, it is supposed, a pre-Celtic origin. The people were, says Pliny, '*admodum dedita superstitionibus*,' and the superstitions had a root in the dim past. The *Deae Matres*, the emblems of fertility, belonged too, no doubt, to a worship which is found in all Indo-European races. There is not much, indeed, in anything that we find which is exclusively characteristic of the Gauls. Here and there there is a name, such as that of the god Lug whom the mythologists identify with Mercury, which survives in characteristic isolation from a more remote past: Ogmios, the inventor of the Ogham inscriptions, is another. But they have each their Irish parallels or prototypes; and from the whole question of the Gaulish mythology emerges again the vexed and difficult debate as to the Celtic influence.

The impression left from a survey of the mythology of the Gauls, be its origin Celtic or pre-Celtic, corresponds with that which is to be derived from their political institutions. Nowhere was there unity: it was the Romans who came to *combine* as well as to *rule*.

Yet it is possible that the great system which overshadows the religion of Gaul may have served to weld the people into a superficial similarity of custom. What most impressed Caesar in the whole land was the organization of the Druids. And here again it is argued that the system was in existence before the coming of the Celts: <sup>1</sup> but the fact that it seems not to have existed in Aquitaine, in the district of Narbonne, or on the borders of the Rhine,

<sup>1</sup> See Holmes, *op. cit.* p. 532; and G. Bloch, in Lavissee, *op. cit.* p. 65.

points to an opposite conclusion.<sup>1</sup> Once more we doubt whether even in religion Gaul was united.

Some hold, following a passage in which Caesar suggests it, that Druidism was introduced from Britain,<sup>2</sup> and having subjugated the earlier religious forms, had assimilated, and assumed command of them: others, that a Druidism was itself the religion of the pre-Celtic inhabitants of Gaul, and that the Druids thus conquered their conquerors. But of the nature of the system the description of Roman writers have left us in no doubt. The Druids were a great hierarchy, a privileged order of priests. They were not hereditary, but were recruited from all classes, though principally from among the nobles. They offered sacrifice, studied the laws of nature, predicted the future. Round them they gathered young men who were taught their sacred lore in metrical form, 'the movements of the stars, the greatness of the universe of nature and the power of the immortal gods.' Theirs was the science, theirs the medicine, of their times; and if they did not actually invent the religion of the Gauls they gave it a ritual and a theology. There can be no doubt that they were by far the strongest body in the Gallic State. What in other lands the King was, what the King did, that among the Gauls were the Druids and the Druids did. Divitiacus the Druid was a commanding figure indeed, of whom men like Cicero knew well, and not only those who had met him in the field or in the camp. He knew, says Cicero, the laws of nature, and predicted the future,<sup>3</sup> and to Druids such as he, no doubt, belonged secrets, mysteries, doctrines, which were quite distinct from the ordinary religious practices of the Gauls. But that they had any community organization such as belonged to Christian monasteries cannot be certainly proved. 'Sodaliciis adstricti consortiis,' says Ammianus

<sup>1</sup> See Desjardins, *Géographie de la Gaule Romaine*, ii. 519.

<sup>2</sup> 'Disciplina in Britannia reperta atque inde in Galliam translata esse existimatur,' *B. G.* vi. 13. So Grupp, *op. cit.* p. 70 note. Dr. Hodgkin also considers (*op. cit.* p. 10) that 'there is no reason to doubt' Caesar's statement.

<sup>3</sup> *De Divinatione*, i. 41, 90.

Marcellinus; but the words are capable of several interpretations, and if highly organized corporations of Druids existed it is strange that Caesar did not mention them among the numerous detailed descriptions which he gives of the people in whom he was so profoundly interested. Certainly there is not evidence enough to compare them, as many scholars have done, with Tibetan Lamas and Christian monks. So, again, we know next to nothing as to how or where the Druids worshipped. Most ancient writers do not speak of temples; Caesar, when he mentions their annual assemblies *in loco consecrato*, is writing of their judicial, not their religious, proceedings. And when Lucan talked of the far off sacred woods in which they dwelt, he was writing after the time when Tiberius and Claudius had forbidden the public exercise of their religion. The remains of temples which exist are probably not pre-Roman; and indeed it is possible that the Celtic temples of Gaul were not buildings but portions of consecrated soil. The *simulacra* which Caesar saw were, as we have said, perhaps no more than gigantic stones.

The conclusion we may well come to is that the religion of the Gauls had little *humanity* about it. The human sacrifices speak eloquently, and beside them is the absence, evidence of which has been well summed up by M. Bloch, of anthropomorphic monuments, a sure sign of the want of connexion between religion and ordinary life. It was not till the introduction and imitation of foreign coins shewed the increasing influence of Graeco-Roman civilization that any change occurred in this respect. In the south-east of Gaul a sculpture at Estremont shews the first timid attempt at native art. Only after the Roman conquest did religious conceptions begin to find expression in plastic workmanship.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. with M. Bloch's article *La religion des Gaulois* in *Revue internationale de Penseignement*, xxix. 533, and xxx. 145, that of M. G. Dottin on the same subject in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. xxxviii. No. 2, and also M. D'Arbois de Jubainville in the *Revue celtique*, xix. 70.

Thus M. Bloch well says :

'Le fait qui se produisit alors est un des plus singuliers. Tout un peuple de dieux prend corps subitement dans la terre cuite, la pierre ou le bronze. Il surgit avec une variété d'attributs qui très évidemment ne sont point improvisés, qui supposent au contraire une longue gestation antérieure. Car ce n'est pas à l'heure de son déclin, dans un temps où elle avait épuisé toute sa force créatrice, que la religion gauloise a pu trouver les images par où elle s'est traduite tout à coup aux yeux des fidèles. Elles existaient dans leurs pensées, elles s'y étaient élaborées lentement. Elles s'en sont élancées comme d'une prison, quand sont tombés les liens qui les y retenaient captives. Ces images, il est vrai, ne s'inspiraient pas exclusivement des croyances nationales. Il s'en faut même de beaucoup. Il en est des monuments comme des inscriptions. Ils participent du même mélange qui a substitué une religion gallo-romaine à la religion gauloise proprement dite. Les dieux qu'ils nous présentent ont dérobé leur physionomie, leurs insignes, leur costume aux mêmes divinités dont ils ont pris les noms. Mais cette fois encore le déguisement n'est pas assez soutenu pour dissimuler entièrement les traits originaux. Ils percent à chaque instant sous le thème banal, sous les copies plus ou moins maladroites de l'art classique. Ils éclatent en symboles bizarres dont l'étrangeté nous déconcerte ou irrite notre curiosité. Ce qui se cache sous ces emblèmes, on le sent bien, c'est l'objet même de nos recherches. Mais cette légende divine dont ils déroulent les épisodes, comment en pénétrer le secret ? Qui interprétera ce langage muet ? Qui arrachera à ces sphinx le mot de l'énigme ?'<sup>1</sup>

Thus the genius of Rome made its way strangely among the Celtic races ; and the acceptance of Roman dominion came, in spite of bitter warfare, not altogether unnaturally or without sympathy among the receptive Gauls.

Let us now cross the Channel with Caesar, and inquire what he found among the Celts of Albion.

'At the end of the first three years of Caesar's proconsulship (58-56 B.C.) having apparently almost completed the conquest of Gaul, he stood a conqueror on the southern shore of the Straits of Dover, looked across at the white cliffs of Albion,

<sup>1</sup> G. Bloch in *Revue internationale de l'enseignement*, as above.



and dreamed of bringing that mysterious island within the circle of Roman dominion. Pretexts for invasion were never lacking to an adventurous proconsul. There were close ties of affinity between many of the northern tribes of Gaul and their British neighbours. Some tribes even bore the same name. The Atrebatas of Arras were reflected in the Atrebatas of Berkshire; there were Belgae in Somerset and Wiltshire as well as in Belgium; even men called Parisii were found, strangely enough, in the East Riding of Yorkshire. Then there was also the connexion, whatever may have been its value, between the religion of the continental and the insular Celts.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Hodgkin may seem, in a passage which follows this, somewhat to exaggerate the religious connexion when he says that the Gauls, in any religious resistance to the Romans, would look across the Channel for 'sympathy and inspiration.' This is to build too much on Caesar's vague words about the 'disciplina.' We have very little information about pre-Roman religion in Britain. We can say that there is no reason to suppose that the Celts had in the island any different religion from that which they had on the continent. But Druidism was not, so far as we have any evidence, the religion of any Brythonic people; the Druids of Gaul would find sympathy only among the Goidels of Britain.<sup>2</sup> Caesar himself draws a sharp distinction between the men of Kent, who 'do not differ greatly in their manners from the inhabitants of Gaul,' and the inland tribes, who are, he says, according to their own tradition, aboriginal. The distinction is not one which can be exactly substantiated; but it supports the view that Britain was divided, as was Gaul. There is no reason to suppose that Druidism had appreciably lost

<sup>1</sup> Hodgkin, *op. cit.* pp. 9-10.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, p. 69, says that the men of Britain might be classified into three groups, 'the Brythonic Celts, who were polytheists of the Aryan type; the non-Celtic natives under the sway of Druidism; and the Goidelic Celts, devotees of a religion which combined Aryan polytheism with Druidism.' He gives instances of the use of the word *derwyddon* later, among which is a tenth century explanation that Jannes and Jambres were the names of two Egyptian Druids (see Zimmer, *Glossae Hibernicae*, p. 183).



strength in the century after Caesar wrote ; but we know that in A.D. 59 Suetonius found Mona (Anglesey) to be the home of Druidism, the centre of the terrible worship which was consummated in human sacrifice,<sup>1</sup> and the abode of a great number of Druids who, whether bards or priests or wizards, were the rulers and objects of superstitious veneration for the tribes of the western coast.

Many writers in England, as in France, have been misled by the remains of a date subsequent to the Roman conquest into identifying the Celtic deities with those of Rome. But the identification, which at its best can be but a rough one, is not possible before the invasion of Claudius. The temples, such as that of the sea-god Nodeus, for example, at Lydney, belong in Britain, as in Gaul, to the days when Romans had settled in the land. Names of rivers no doubt preserve the names of Celtic gods ; but the evidence, such as it is, would tend rather to shew that in Britain Druidism was the primitive religion which the later Celts in conquering the country had assimilated and perhaps modified. The distribution of tribes, so far as we can discover it, at the time of Caesar's invasion and in the century which followed it, substantiates the view that in Britain, as in Gaul, there was no strong tie, political or religious, to bind the people together.

There was undoubtedly, on the other hand, the racial distinction among the Celts between Goidels and Brythons. Above the Neolithic survivors whom the Goidels had conquered stood the later conquerors, the Brythons ; and the examination of the geographical distribution of races in the first century after Christ reveals a strange confusion of races and tongues. Here at every point we are helped by the evidence of inscriptions.<sup>2</sup> It is this which shews us a population largely non-Celtic, but ruled by Goidels, in the Dumnoni of Devon and Cornwall. 'No part of the country west of the Dorsetshire Stour and the Parret,' says Professor Rhys, 'is probably to be regarded as Brythonic.' So again the land between the sea, the Teme, the Severn, and the Bristol Channel, inhabited by the Demetae and

Tacitus, *Annals*, xiv. 29, 30. <sup>2</sup> See Hübner's *Inscr. Brit. Chris*

the Silures, was a land of Goidels who had assimilated the pre-Celtic peoples.

The rest of what is now Wales, at least up to the Mawddach, belonged to the Brythonic Ordovices : beyond them westwards was a Goidelic population in the north-west and in Mona, the Druid isle. Middle England, east of the Ordovices, belonged to the Cornavii and Coritani, and the latter held what is now Lincolnshire. North again, up to the Caledonian forest, the Brigantes stretched across the whole isle, with the Parisii of the Yorkshire coast perhaps independent. The tribes west and north again were probably not Celtic at all, or only to a very slight extent ; in later years they stood together against Roman rule till they were driven back behind the Nith. The Brigantes who had many subject tribes among them, were themselves Brythons, while the Caledonians were Goidels, and the men of the extreme north were Iberian or Neolithic. Returning again to the south and south-east we find the whole country under the rule of the Brythons. To them belonged the men of Kent whom Caesar saw, and the Atrebates among whom we find the coins of one Commius—who may have been the very King of the Atrebates of Gaul, driven from his lands by the Roman legions—Dubnovellaunus, whose name turns up so strangely in an inscription at Angora, and the family of Cunobelinus, enshrined in literature by the genius of Shakespeare.

A great contrast is presented when we compare these scattered and divided tribes with the races of Gaul dwelling in settled habitations. There was in Britain, when Caesar came, no colony from the civilized cities of the East ; there was indeed no great town that we know of ; the commerce which had begun was scanty and fortuitous—the merchants whom Caesar questioned in Gaul could tell him nothing of the best harbours or of the habits and the warlike strength of the natives. Herodotus knew nothing of the tin-islands which he named, and it is not likely that Caesar knew what Pytheas had told. Then, for a moment, the cloud lifted : Caesar came and saw but did not conquer. And then again silence.

For the 'century of suspense' which lay between Caesar's invasions and the Roman conquest of Britain we know enough to say that the land was one divided among three peoples and languages, and that the oldest folk and the oldest tongue still survived in strength. Beyond this date we do not pass. With the coming of Caesar we touch the limits of recorded history. Caesar himself, when he tells of what he has himself seen, begins a new age in the history of Gaul and Britain. Then, after a pause, come Tacitus and the inscriptions, the walls, and the remains which many French scholars—and in England, Dr. Haverfield—have made bright for us. It is in the dimmest recesses of the past that we have searched, and even these have their surviving memories; for, as Professor Rhys says so happily, 'skulls are harder than consonants, and races lurk when languages slink away.'

---

#### ART. VII.—IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION AND THE REFORM OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

1. *The Book of Trinity College, Dublin.* (Belfast, 1892.)
2. *Report of the Royal Commission on Trinity College, Dublin.* (London, 1878.)
3. *Report of the Royal Commission on Irish University Education.* (London, 1902.)
4. *Correspondence in the 'Irish Times,'* August 1906. (Dublin.)

THE problem of University Education in Ireland has engaged the attention of successive administrations for many years, and a great deal of public money has been expended with the desire of providing for Irish Roman Catholics educational facilities of which they may avail themselves without scruple of conscience. The Queen's University, with its colleges at Belfast, Cork, and Galway, was established mainly with this object in view. Half a century later, the Royal University was endowed with the

same purpose. In 1873 an Act was passed which swept away all religious tests at Trinity College, Dublin, which had hitherto reserved all its fellowships and professorships for members of the Church of Ireland. It was hoped that thus the difficulty which Roman Catholics had felt in entering the University of Dublin would disappear. Unfortunately none of these projects succeeded; but the reason of their failure is not doubtful. In no case had the Roman Catholics of Ireland been given that for which they asked—namely, a University which should be under their own control. They had been given something quite different, something for which they did not ask, and which they did not want. It is not surprising that they remained dissatisfied, and that the policy pursued repeatedly by the State has only served to exasperate those whom it was intended to benefit. At the present moment, Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges are under the ban of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the Royal University is a mere examining board which tests knowledge acquired elsewhere, but does not provide teaching or any of the advantages incidental to a residential college.

The Report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1901 to inquire into Irish University education outside Trinity College has not been acted upon. It was a strong commission, and it is unfortunate that its recommendations have been neglected and ignored. But it was felt by many who were interested in the matter that before legislation was initiated it would be desirable that full information as to the present condition and efficiency of Trinity College—a subject expressly excluded from the purview of Lord Robertson's Commission—should be given to the public. And accordingly the King has been moved to appoint a new Commission to inquire into the 'present state of Trinity College, Dublin, and of the University of Dublin,' the methods of government of the University and the college, and kindred topics, and 'the place which Trinity College, Dublin, and the University of Dublin now hold as organs of the higher education in Ireland, and the steps proper to be taken to increase their usefulness in the country.'

These terms of reference are very wide, and enable the Commissioners to deal not only with needed reforms in the constitution and administration of Trinity College, but with the larger question of Irish University Education in general. The Commission will have the advantage of the judicial impartiality of Sir Edward Fry as their chairman, and one of the ablest of the Irish judges, Chief Baron Palles, is also a member. The Chief Baron is a devout Roman Catholic and a consistent supporter in educational matters of the policy of the Roman hierarchy. Sir Thomas Raleigh, Mr. S. H. Butcher, M.P., Professor Henry Jackson, and the Principal of the University of London, Sir Arthur Rücker, worthily representing science, are academic experts, and it is to them that we chiefly look for proposals of academic reform made in the interests of higher education. We cannot think that the Irish Government was well advised in nominating as a member of the Commission a gentleman so openly hostile to Trinity College as Dr. Douglas Hyde has shewn himself to be, and its action is the more difficult to understand as Dr. Hyde has no special knowledge of educational matters. But he is the President of the Gaelic League, and Mr. Bryce's newly aroused infatuation for the study (on the part of other people) of the Irish language has no doubt secured his appointment. Of the remaining members of the Commission, one is a Roman Catholic physician appointed to represent the medical schools attended by Roman Catholic students; and the other is one of the most junior of the Fellows of Trinity College, nominated by the Board of that institution on the ground that he too is of the Roman Catholic faith. Upon the Commission there is no one qualified to speak with authority for the Church of Ireland, and this omission will seem the more remarkable when it is remembered that nearly 80 per cent. of the students of Trinity College belong to that Church, and that one of the most important questions which is to come under review is the position of the Divinity School and its future relations with the University. But on the whole the Commission is a strong one, and its more important members may be

trusted to do their work with impartiality and independently of external authority or of political bias.

The Commission has not yet held any public sittings, but already an active correspondence has been carried on in the Irish daily papers, which reflects the hopes and the fears that its appointment has inspired. It is clear that the large question at issue is that of the best means of providing increased facilities for University education, of which Irish Roman Catholics can take advantage. This is an urgent problem, although the grievance of which Roman Catholics complain has too often been exaggerated. It must be remembered, in the first place, that the number of Irish Roman Catholics who are debarred by religious scruple from University education of the type now provided at Trinity College is comparatively small. The fact that three out of every four persons in Ireland is a Roman Catholic does not of course prove anything as to the balance of religious denominations among the University-going classes. The overwhelming majority of Irish Roman Catholics are poor peasants, who will not be directly affected by the creation of new universities or colleges. One of the greatest needs of Ireland at present is that the labour of these people should be expended upon the land which costly and elaborate legislation has secured for them. To divert the Irish peasantry from farming by suggesting that manual labour is less honourable than the work of a clerk would be a national crime. And when we go a little higher in the social scale, and consider how far University education should be placed more nearly within the reach of the sons of substantial farmers and the like, we perceive at once that what is desirable in this regard is that opportunities for professional and technical education should be fully provided, but that there is no demand among these classes for education of the type provided at the older Universities. It has been said, appositely enough, that what is desired is not so much a 'Catholic' University as a 'Democratic' University, which will be inexpensive and will provide technical training. The truth is that the number of Roman Catholics in Ireland who can afford a University education



in the higher sense—which must always be a costly privilege except to talented boys who can win scholarships—is small. They have gone in large numbers to the Royal University—which does not provide lectures—because it is cheap; and the majority of Roman Catholic young men seeking professions will probably continue to go there, no matter what residential colleges may be established for their benefit.

There is, however, a minority of Roman Catholic students who earnestly desire, and whose parents are able and willing to pay for, a University education; and it is in the interests of this minority that State aid is being sought. Trinity College, Dublin, is, indeed, open to them as it is to everybody. Since Mr. Fawcett's Act in 1873, no religious tests are exacted or permitted. Fellowships and scholarships are open to all and sundry, and no man is under any academic disability because of the creed which he professes. It was hoped, thirty years ago, that the 'nationalization' of Dublin University had been secured by the abolition of tests, and the honest endeavour of the University authorities ever since has been to deal impartially with students of all creeds, and to protect their religious convictions, so far as they can be protected in the free atmosphere of academic life. It has never been suggested that Roman Catholic students have suffered anything, at the hands either of their teachers or of their fellow undergraduates, because of their creed. Nevertheless, Roman Catholics have not been given the sanction of their bishops to make use of Trinity College; and the result has been that during the period which has elapsed since all its privileges were offered to them, not more than 7 or 8 per cent. of the undergraduates have belonged to the Church of Rome. The Fawcett Act was not asked for by the Roman Catholics of Ireland. When it was passed it satisfied in no way their aspirations, and it has failed to realize the anticipations of those who supported it.

Irish 'Protestants' are too apt to assume that the grievances of which their Roman Catholic fellow countrymen complain are wholly imaginary, inasmuch as Trinity



College is freely open to them, should they desire to use it. And of recent years liberal offers have been made by the Trinity authorities to establish a chapel for Roman Catholic undergraduates, and to sanction the appointment by the Roman bishops of lecturers in religious knowledge. The uncompromising refusal which was made to these proposals by Cardinal Logue, in 1903, shews (it is urged) that the Roman bishops will not be satisfied with anything short of complete control, and that they are unreasonable people who are not open to argument. But there is another side to the question. It is quite clear that what the Roman bishops desire is that the 'faith and morals' of their young men shall be protected by what they regard as sufficient safeguards during the period of their undergraduate career. Of the sufficiency of the protection offered at Trinity College, they—and not those who oppose them—are the best judges. And their point of view is lucidly explained in a recent 'Statement' which has been furnished to the Royal Commission by the Roman hierarchy, and published in the Dublin papers of August 2, 1906:

'A college, whether for ecclesiastical or lay students, is a home in which the students, under a domestic discipline into which religion largely enters, complete the education which began in their parents' home. Public prayer, catechetical instruction, and the profession of a common religious Faith, are of the essence of collegiate life. It is so in the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, and in Trinity College, Dublin, itself. The few [Roman] Catholics who study in these colleges do not invalidate the argument. They are exceptions and stand apart from the common life. Being a few, they are generally treated with special consideration, like guests in a family, but the College routine with its religious practices goes on independently of them. It would be quite another thing if, instead of being a few, they were equal or nearly equal in number to the others, and instead of being ignored in the College discipline, provision had to be made in it for their religion also. A system of this kind seems to be a practical impossibility. You may have a Catholic College or a Protestant College; but you cannot have a College which will be, at the same time, positively both Catholic and Protestant; and the inevitable result of an attempt to set

up, for the first time in the history of Universities, an institution of the kind, would, as regards religion, be negative—that is, the exclusion of all religion.

‘That is mixed education in its most pernicious development, and the [Roman] Catholics of Ireland who have borne for long years the penalties of their resistance to this system can hardly be expected now to be parties to imposing it on themselves.’

This is, to our mind, a fair and candid statement, and it brings out the real difficulty. Irish ‘Protestants’ think ‘mixed education’ to be the best; Irish Roman Catholics will have none of it. Why should either party be asked to give way to the other? Is there not here an irreconcilable divergence of principle?

We have the utmost sympathy with the aspirations of those who long for the day when the youth of Ireland may be educated in the same institution, learning mutual tolerance and respect from daily association in the laboratories, the library, the dining-hall, the athletic rivalries of a great College. Much would be gained by such a common life. But we agree with the Roman prelates in thinking that it could only be secured by the ignoring of religion and by the secularization—in fact, if not in theory—of the College which attempted the task. There are, in short, two inconsistent ideals of education which cannot be reconciled. There is the ideal of Liberalism, which holds that scientific, philosophical, and historical investigation should be quite free, and that it is the sacred duty of teachers and of taught alike to follow truth wherever it leads them. It is not an irreligious ideal, for all Truth comes from Him Who said ‘I am the Truth,’ and the common labours of a College or a University which holds up this high ideal receive their highest consecration in common worship. But it is quite distinct from the Ultramontane ideal, favoured by the Roman bishops—not in Ireland only, although there most conspicuously, but in Spain and Italy as well. According to this view, investigation in any department of knowledge is liable at any moment to be checked by the voice of ecclesiastical authority. The bishops are the legitimate

guardians of 'faith and morals,' and it is not only their right, but their duty, to silence by every means in their power a teacher who has, in their opinion, taught any doctrine or expounded any scientific theory which cannot be harmonized with the belief of the Roman Church. We hold that the former of these ideals is alone truly Catholic, and that the latter is but a survival of that mediæval view of the nature of the Church's authority which led to the condemnation of Galileo. But, however that may be, it is certain that the two ideals are inconsistent and irreconcilable, and it is to the credit of the Roman prelates that they have—with clearer insight than many of those who criticize their policy—always appreciated this. The 'nationalization' of Trinity College—if it means the offering of equal opportunity to all creeds—is already an accomplished fact; but the 'nationalization' of Trinity College, if it means the combination of two divergent and incompatible ideals of education, is an idle dream.

What provision, then, ought to be made for those Roman Catholics—not very numerous, but yet representing an important element in Irish life—who desire University education, and who are able and willing to pay for it, but who are anxious above all things to be loyal to their Church? In order to answer this question, it is essential to ascertain in the first place what it is that the Roman Catholics of Ireland really desire, not what other people think would be good for them. Members of the Church of Ireland or Presbyterians or Methodists will be entirely within their rights in criticizing any scheme that is put forward, if it infringes in any way upon their privileges, or if it seems to them to be unjust to the non-Roman members of the community. But it is not for them to decide in the first instance what is the most suitable provision for Romanists, and to offer them that, whether it be agreeable to them or not. The pursuance of this policy has been the cause of the failure to accomplish their avowed purpose of the Queen's Colleges and of Fawcett's Act; and it is to be hoped that the lesson may not be lost upon the Legislature. In the next place, it is necessary to seek the opinion, not of isolated

and independent members of the Roman Communion, but of those who are entitled to speak with authority on her behalf—that is, the Roman bishops. It is well known that in Ireland a few of the better educated Roman Catholic laity are impatient of episcopal control in political, social, or academic life. They have seen the fruits of it in countries like Spain or South America, and they would gladly secure for themselves, if they could, a measure of freedom equal to that enjoyed by their co-religionists in the United States or in England. This spirit is natural enough, and Anglicans will regard it with sympathetic feelings. A highly interesting letter on the subject from Cardinal Newman was printed for the first time in the *Irish Times* of August 8, and we reproduce a few suggestive sentences. The letter is dated December 10, 1873:

‘ . . . One of the chief evils which I deplored in the management of the affairs of the University<sup>1</sup> twenty years ago when I was in Ireland was the absolute refusal with which my urgent representations were met, that the Catholic laity should be allowed to co-operate with the Archbishops in the work. As far as I can see there are ecclesiastics all over Europe whose policy it is to keep the laity at arm’s length, and hence the laity have become disgusted and become infidel; and only two parties exist, both ultras in opposite directions. I came away from Ireland with the distressing fear that in that Catholic country in like manner, there was to be an antagonism, as time went on, between the Hierarchy and the educated classes. You will be doing the greatest possible benefit to the Catholic cause all over the world if you succeed in making the University a middle station, at which clergy and laity can meet so as to learn to understand and to yield to each other, and from which as from a common ground they may act in union upon an age which is running headlong into infidelity; and however evil in themselves may be the men and the measures which of late years have had so great a success against the Holy See, they will in the providence of God be made the instruments of good if they teach us priests that the *obsequium* which the laity owe to religion is *rationabile*.’

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the ‘Catholic’ University, in St. Stephen’s Green, of which Dr. Newman was Rector.

The veiled antagonism between a section of the laity and the Roman bishops which Dr. Newman deplored in this interesting letter, and which was one of the chief causes of his retirement from his post at Dublin, still continues, and has to be reckoned with. Educated Roman Catholic laymen frequently express in private their regret that the policy of the bishops should continue to be marked by an arrogant and intolerant spirit. But when it comes to public action, all, save a very few, and those not men of commanding influence, keep silent. At this moment, whatever may be wished, the fact is that the bishops are masters of the situation, and there is no sign that they are losing control of their people. It was at the instance of the bishops that the Queen's Colleges were branded as 'godless'; it was at the instance of the bishops that Trinity College has been placed under a ban. There is nothing to be gained by negotiations which have not the bishops' explicit and public approval. And thus we come to the question, what proposals for University reform have been put forward by the Roman Catholic hierarchy?

The answer to this question is clearly and candidly given in the statement presented by the bishops to the Royal Commission. They state that Irish Roman Catholics would be *prepared to accept* any of the following solutions: '(1) A University for Catholics; (2) A new college in the University of Dublin; (3) A new college in the Royal University; but that on no account would they accept any scheme of mixed education in Trinity College, Dublin.' They do not, however, say that they would be *satisfied* with any one of these; and they make it clear that the first named is the only one which they regard as adequate. 'Any solution,' they say, 'that would give us a college instead of a University falls far short of what the [Roman] Catholics of Ireland have a right to claim.' Consequently it must be borne in mind that this vexed question will not be set at rest, nor will agitation cease, if either the second or third solution suggested above be adopted by the State.

We are strongly of opinion that the most just, the wisest, the most liberal policy is to give the Roman bishops

that for which they ask—namely, a University which shall be (practically) under their own control. It is generally understood that they are willing to accept that co-operation of laymen which in Newman's time they disdained, and that they do not demand as a right that they should be *ex officio* represented on the governing body of the new institution. But as to this, no public pronouncement which can be quoted has been definitely made, and it is not well to trust to rumour. The point is not, indeed, of much importance, for in any case the success of the University would entirely depend upon the goodwill of the bishops, and, whether directly or indirectly represented, they would inevitably dominate its policy. To provide suitable endowments for such an institution would cost a considerable sum—perhaps a million or more of public money—for if the thing is to be done at all, it should be done handsomely. But when we remember that this great and permanent benefit to the Roman Catholics of Ireland could be secured at the cost of a single battleship (which would probably be out of date in a dozen years), we shall not think the price an excessive one to pay.

The objections to this scheme which are most loudly urged by Ulster Orangemen, and by those who think with them, are that it is iniquitous to ask the State to provide money for Roman Catholic education, and that a University initiated under such auspices would be the fertile seedplot of disloyalty and anti-Imperial sentiment. We fear that, for some time to come, the latter objection would prove to be well-founded. The bishops collectively, and Archbishop Healy, of Tuam, in particular, have spoken of the 'anti-national' tradition of Trinity College—the College, we may note in passing, which was the Alma Mater of Grattan, of Swift, of Burke—as a reason why Romanists should stay away from it; and there is little doubt that the spirit which prevented the singing of 'God Save the King' at a recent Commemoration of the 'Royal University of Ireland,' would have free scope in any institution dominated by the present hierarchy. But it has ever to be borne in mind that a large part of Roman Catholic Ireland



is disloyal to the Crown and hostile to the Union ; that is a fact which lies behind all Irish controversies. Is it too much to hope that the removal of a grievance and the larger opportunity of education which a Roman Catholic University would offer to the Roman Catholic youth of the country, would do something to promote a more sane and tolerant spirit ? In its beginnings, the new institution would in all probability be openly and extravagantly disloyal, and no doubt a good deal of its energy would be exhausted in the quixotic attempt to replace the English language by Gaelic. But in time wiser counsels would prevail ; a larger outlook would be the inevitable consequence of education ; and as Irishmen began to understand that 'Hinter dem Berge sind auch Leute,' the provincialism which stands for patriotism with so many would yield to a more cosmopolitan and Catholic view of life.

The other objection to which we have referred—namely, that 'Protestants ought not to be taxed to pay for Popish education, of which they entirely disapprove,' is one which is often put forward in Orange speeches. It seems to be forgotten by those who urge it that the endowment of Roman Catholic teaching is no new thing. At the disestablishment of the Irish Church Maynooth College—the principal theological seminary of the Roman priesthood in Ireland—was endowed in perpetuity by the payment from the public funds of a sum equal to fourteen times the annual Parliamentary grant—viz. of a capital sum of (approximately) 400,000*l.* At this moment the overwhelming majority of Primary Schools in Ireland are under Roman management and controlled by the Roman clergy ; they are denominational in fact, although not in name, and yet the entire cost of their maintenance is borne by the State. Or, again, the indirect endowment which University College, Dublin—an institution belonging to the Jesuits—receives from Royal University funds, by the appointment of Jesuit Fathers as examiners and fellows in that institution, is the endowment of denominational education in what Protestant critics would regard as its most offensive form. To acquiesce in this expenditure of

public money, and yet to object to the establishment of a Roman University on the ground that 'denominational teaching should not be paid for by the State,' is to cheat oneself with phrases. It is much to be hoped that the House of Commons will not be led away by any catchwords of this sort, and that its Protestant members will recognize that the distinction between the indirect or veiled, and the direct and explicit, endowment of Roman Catholic education is not a distinction of which Protestantism has any right to be proud.

There was a time when any proposal for a Roman Catholic University would have received strenuous opposition from Trinity College and its supporters. But it is probable that such opposition would not now be encouraged by the wiser and more experienced (not necessarily the oldest) members of that great corporation. Certainly, the establishment of a rival University in Dublin under Roman Catholic and 'nationalist' control would mean, for a time at least, the exclusion of Trinity men from medical and engineering posts in most parts of Ireland; for the local boards and County Councils would undoubtedly favour the new schools. But this system of 'boycott' is already in operation, and Royal University doctors are likely to be preferred to those from the Trinity Medical School, even if no new institution be set going. Under present conditions in Ireland, Trinity College must face this difficulty, but she need not be afraid of it. Her outlook is not confined to Ireland, and men are trained in her lecture rooms for public and professional service all over the Empire. And, apart from her professional schools, she has great academic traditions to maintain as a home of sound learning, which will continue to draw students to her halls, if she continues to be true to the principles which have established her reputation. No new-born academy can all at once secure such a position as she enjoys, and there is no likelihood that a Roman Catholic University, if established to-morrow, would follow the policy of the ancient Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin. A modern institution with good professional schools, where men are trained so that

they can earn their living creditably as doctors or lawyers or engineers—this is the kind of ideal which (to all seeming) Irish Roman Catholics have set before themselves. Of the function of a University in extending the domain of knowledge and in promoting research, they have not shewn any consciousness in their public appeals for a hearing. The Roman bishops, in the 'Statement' from which we have already quoted, put the point in their own way. The studies of Trinity College, they say, 'which have run in one groove for ages, to suit the requirements of certain classes of the community, could with difficulty be now brought into a modern shape so as to meet the actual needs of the country.' We may be permitted to express the hope that Trinity College will not be so unmindful of her past, and of the services which she has rendered to the cause of learning, as to allow any prospect of a temporary increase in the number of her students to encourage her to transform herself into an association of technical or professional schools.

Of the alternative schemes which the Roman bishops are 'prepared to accept,' while still deeming them inadequate, the least objectionable and the easiest to carry into effect is the establishment of a new College in the existing Royal University. This was the course recommended by the Royal Commission of 1901. The Commissioners were impressed with the fact that the Royal University was a mere examining body, and they recommended that it should be transformed into a Teaching Body, 'an autonomous college on an adequate and impressive scale' being provided under Roman Catholic control. It would not, indeed, be difficult to make arrangements by which the existing Jesuit College in St. Stephen's Green should be enlarged and given suitable equipment. Several of its professors are already engaged in the service of the Royal University, and they would find it an easy matter to accommodate themselves to new and improved conditions. It is unlikely that the bishops would consent to the continuance of the control which the Jesuit Fathers now exercise, for it is well known that the views of the Society of Jesus and of the Roman hierarchy do not always coincide. But the Royal

Commissioners of 1901 came to the conclusion that an arrangement of this kind would be feasible, and we believe that the adoption of their recommendations would even now be accepted as mitigating to a great extent the grievance of which Romanists complain.

The worst of all possible solutions, in our judgement, if the interests of higher education are not to be postponed to political opportunism, would be the establishment of a Roman Catholic College, side by side with Trinity College, within the University of Dublin. To those who are familiar with the English system of a University embracing several Colleges, it may seem at first sight that the plan would be a good one to follow in Ireland, and it is undoubtedly the case that at an early period in the history of the University of Dublin a second College was contemplated as a possible development. But a little reflection will shew that there is really no analogy between English University organization and a scheme of this kind. The success of the Oxford and Cambridge system depends ultimately on the fact that the various colleges of which the University is composed are animated by the same ideals of education, and that the healthy rivalry which exists between them is not infected to any appreciable extent by the jealousies of theological or political partisanship. They have a common purpose—the furtherance of liberal education—and in the accomplishment of this purpose they are ready to submit to the regulations which the University authorities ordain as to courses of study, lectures, examinations, and the like. There is one uniform standard for degrees, and the adjustment of lines of study or the selection of text-books so as to meet the prejudices or traditions of any of the constituent colleges is a thing unknown. But were a denominational college for Romanists introduced into the University of Dublin the relation which it would bear to Trinity College would be quite different from the relation in which the colleges at Oxford or at Cambridge stand to one another. Its educational ideal would be that of Ultramontaniam; its teachers would be (directly or indirectly) subject to ecclesiastical authority; the philosophical and historical text-books in

use at Trinity College would be inadmissible; and the regulations devised by the common University Court would have to be of such a character that, on the one hand, they would not hurt the prejudices of the Roman bishops, and, on the other hand, would be in accordance with the scientific traditions of Trinity College.

There would be perpetual conflict between the representatives of the two colleges on the University Court, and it seems that this has not escaped the astute minds who are responsible for the statement drawn up by the Roman prelates, in which it is distinctly laid down that the 'two college' solution of their difficulty would 'fall far short of what the Catholics of Ireland would have a right to claim.' In other words, if the bishops found that they could not, by means of the representatives of the new college, dominate the University Court and secure such safeguards for their undergraduates as they deemed fitting, it would be open to them to wreck the whole scheme by issuing a Pastoral of denunciation. So strongly has the danger of conflict between the two colleges been felt, that some politicians who are ardent advocates of this solution have suggested that the new college should be entirely autonomous as regards its curriculum and its teaching staff, its ancient liberty being also left to Trinity College. This, however, is a proposition which is academically impossible. If there is to be *one* University, and students of the two constituent colleges are to claim the same degrees, there must be a supreme University Court which shall regulate the courses of study in both its colleges. A college may be (and ought to be) autonomous as regards its domestic discipline; it cannot be independent of the University whose degrees it seeks. It would be a grievous injustice to Trinity if the students of a newly affiliated college were permitted to have the prestige of the degree of Dublin University without conforming to the same standards which have given that degree its value in the past.

The University examinations must be held in common; that is almost a self-evident principle. And the difficulties which would arise as to the appointment of University

examiners or University professors would be of a nature for which there is, happily, no parallel in English academic life. The scandal of public education in Ireland for many years, both in its primary and secondary departments, has been the method by which examiners and inspectors are selected. We speak of what is notorious and admitted when we say that on the occasion of a vacancy in an examinership under the Intermediate Education Board, or of an inspectorship under the National Board, the first question that is asked is, *not*, Who is the fittest man available? *but*, Is it the turn of Roman Catholics or of Protestants to appoint? The choice is determined in the first instance by the supposed need of maintaining the balance between the several religious denominations. This is what comes of 'mixed' educational boards representing rival creeds. To introduce such a system into the University of Dublin would be to destroy public confidence in the value of its degrees, and to lower the standards of higher education in Ireland. For a University Court composed of representatives from the two colleges would act inevitably in the same way. Were two Anglican or Presbyterian Professors of Mathematics or Examiners in History appointed in succession, be they never so famous as mathematicians or historians, the cry would be raised at once that Roman Catholics were not receiving their fair share of academic dignities, and a new grievance would be created. It is because of the miserable results which 'mixed' boards have achieved in regard to primary and intermediate education, that those Irishmen who love learning for its own sake look with apprehension on the proposal to introduce this discredited system into the University of Dublin. It is generally understood that a memorial has been presented to the Royal Commission, signed by an overwhelming majority of the teaching staff, which deprecates any such 'solution' as this of the University question.

Of the three suggestions, then, which the Roman bishops deem worthy of consideration, we hold that the best in every way is that which they prefer, and with which alone they have expressed entire satisfaction—namely, that they



should be given a University of their own, of which they may make what they please. They would probably turn it into a congeries of professional schools, under strict ecclesiastical control; and Trinity College, Dublin, would be left free to maintain its ancient traditions of liberty of thought and investigation. Sad it is that the youth of Ireland cannot be brought up together, but fundamental divergences of principle cannot be explained away, and it is best to recognize them frankly.

We observe that a small number of Fellows and Professors (none of whom, however, is a member of the Board, and only one a member of the University Council) have taken the somewhat unusual step of publishing beforehand a statement<sup>1</sup> to be presented to the Royal Commission, in which they sketch a scheme that they have devised for the 'nationalization' of Trinity College. The signatories think that all difficulties can be removed by the appointment of an Advisory Committee to guard the religious interests of Roman Catholics, by the establishment of Roman Catholic professorships of philosophy and of history, and by the reconstitution of the Governing Body of Trinity College in such a way that, for the next twenty-five years, one-quarter of the total number of its members shall be nominated by a Roman Catholic electorate. They also express their approval of the offer made in 1903 by the Trinity authorities to sanction the erection of a Roman chapel and the provision of Roman teaching, should the bishops desire it. These propositions have, it appears, been drawn up in co-operation with a few Roman Catholic laymen, who would like to be freed from that domination by their bishops which is the principal factor in the situation. For the most part, however, these gentlemen have not given their names to the public—a significant circumstance. Of the generous spirit which the proposals indicate there can be no doubt; but their wisdom is not so clear. They betray no consciousness of the real difficulty—namely, that two inconsistent ideals cannot be united in the same institution; and it shews a singular lack of experience in

<sup>1</sup> *The Irish Times*, Aug. 1, 1906.

public affairs to suppose that the great privilege of direct representation upon the Governing Body of Trinity, which they offer to Roman Catholics *as such*, could ever be withdrawn were it once conceded. Indeed, Father Delany, the head of the Jesuit College in St. Stephen's Green, has already indicated that even the concession of one-quarter of the seats upon the Governing Body would not be a sufficient recognition of Roman Catholic rights. But the document is not, perhaps, of serious importance, for its proposals have already been repudiated by Archbishop Walsh and his colleagues. Mixed education is precisely what they do not approve, as we have already pointed out. That the scheme, moreover, suggests a direct infringement of Fawcett's Act, which abolished religious tests at Trinity, and proposes to reintroduce them in the interests of one denomination, is of itself sufficient reason for rejecting it. Were it likely to receive the adhesion of the recognized representatives of Romanism, it would become necessary for the Church of Ireland to enter an emphatic protest against a scheme which would break up the one public institution in Ireland in which she can be sure of impartial treatment, and would confer upon another communion privileges which have deliberately been withdrawn from herself, in the name of educational equality. Reformers of Trinity College cannot afford to forget that, in fact, nearly 80 per cent. of her undergraduates are Irish Churchmen: the representatives of that Church are the only firm friends she has in the country; and to alienate their sympathy in the hope of conciliating those who have been consistently hostile to her ideals and her methods is the most foolish of policies.

The real interest of this ill-advised manifesto is to be found in the assumption which underlies its proposals—namely, that the existing constitution of Trinity College is in need of reformation, and that the present system of government ought not to be continued. To inquire into these matters is the primary duty of the Royal Commission, and various important suggestions have come from Trinity College itself as to the best method of procedure. The constitution of the Governing Body is, indeed, a curious

survival from the past, and outside the members of that body and those who hope soon to share its dignities, it is not likely that it will find many champions. From its foundation the College has been governed by the Provost and the seven Senior of the Fellows, who constitute what is known as the 'Board.' They have absolute control of the finances; they elect to all scholarships and Fellowships, and to a certain number of professorships and lecturer-ships; no grace can even be considered by the Senate which they have not approved; they manage all the College property (and the University has no property other than this); their verdict is final as to the issue of all examinations; they have the principal voice in the regulation of courses of study, and in some important cases (such as those of scholarship and Fellowship examinations), theirs is the only voice. Besides all this, they retain in their own hands the principal executive offices in the College. The Bursar, who looks after the estates, and is supreme as to all domestic expenditure; the Registrar, who keeps the minutes of the Board, and is responsible for the immense correspondence which is incidental to the business of a great college; the internal Auditor, who controls the accounts; the Senior Lecturer, who controls the examinations and selects (in general) the examiners; the Senior Dean, who is (nominally) the chief officer of discipline—all these officials are members of the Board. In other words, the principal executive offices in Trinity College are in the hands of a body of men whose average age exceeds seventy, and who, owing to the method by which they succeed to their posts, have never had an opportunity of learning how to discharge their duties until they are past sixty years of age.

Half a century ago this amazing system of government by the Septem Seniores did not work badly, and those who defend it point (and with justice) to the record of the College, which is, indeed, a brilliant one. A system cannot be wholly bad which has produced such creditable results. But there are important differences between the conditions which prevailed fifty years ago, and those in which the College finds itself at present. In the first place, the average

age of the Senior Fellows was then much less than it is now. In those days all the Fellows (except two or three) were required to be in Holy Orders, and the valuable benefices in the patronage of the College enabled many of the Fellows to retire from academic life, and induced them to devote their energies to pastoral work. Furthermore, when Irish bishoprics had to be filled, the Crown naturally looked to the clerical Fellows of Trinity College to supply a good proportion of the vacancies. But all this has been swept away by Disestablishment, and by the abolition of tests which was brought about by Fawcett's Act. During the last forty years only four Fellows have taken Holy Orders—an ominous circumstance, indeed—and retirement from academic work has been infrequent. The consequence is that promotion is much less rapid within the College than it used to be, and that the average age of the Senior Fellows is greater by ten or more years than it was in the period when the system worked successfully and without friction. The change which has thus been silently brought about by Disestablishment and its consequences in the constitution of the Governing Body call imperatively for consideration. Again, the increasing specialization of studies and the growth of the professional schools have made it more and more difficult, as the years go by, for any single body of men—however capable and impartial—to control all the departments of University life. It is necessary, if the work of the College is to be carried on with complete efficiency in the future, that the powers of the existing Board be delegated in large measure to syndicates or committees composed of men who are possessed of expert knowledge.

It might have been expected that the University Council, which was brought into being after the passing of Fawcett's Act, would have gone far to alleviate the difficulties to which we have alluded. Unlike the Board, it is an elective and representative body, and great hopes were entertained of its usefulness thirty years ago. Undoubtedly its functions, which embrace the nomination to most of the Professorships and the power (in conjunction with the Board) of arranging the courses of study precedent to degrees, are important,

and they have not been ill discharged. But it has no voice in matters of finance, and this enables the Board to retain as of old the supreme control. Nor can it be said that the co-operation of the University Council has ever been heartily welcomed by the Board. For many years the policy of the Board—natural in the case of an ancient and highly conservative body, jealous of its privileges—has reduced the powers of the Council to its lowest terms. If the principle of government by the Septem Seniores were frankly abandoned, and a new Board constituted, which should consist of members elected on account of special fitness, and not solely because they had lived longer than their colleagues, there would be no need of the clumsy dual machinery of Board and Council. In academic affairs, the authority of knowledge cannot be superseded by the authority of age without disastrous results. We venture to hope that the Royal Commission will recognize the fact, and will deal with this highly important matter in such a way as to enable Trinity College to adapt itself, with even greater efficiency than heretofore, to the changing conditions of academic life.

The system of election to Fellowship at Dublin will also come under the review of the Commissioners, and will need careful handling. At present there is an annual election to Fellowship, for which there is a special examination of the most elaborate kind. Candidates may present themselves in classics, Semitic languages, mathematics, experimental science, and philosophy, taking as many or as few of these subjects as they please—the number of marks assigned to each subject being carefully fixed. In practice, men always take two subjects at least, but never more than three. The Board are free to elect any candidate whom they prefer; but, in practice, they have only once, since Disestablishment, elected a candidate who did not score the highest marks. The advantages of this system are twofold. First, there is no question as to the impartiality of the election, and this—in a country distracted by theological and political feuds—is of the utmost importance. Secondly, as a man cannot expect to win his Fellowship by proficiency,

however remarkable, in a single department, he is obliged to cultivate a second line of study, probably akin to, but not identical with, that for which he has special aptitude. The result is that the Fellows of Trinity are remarkable, as a body, for general culture; and the life of the society is benefited by the interest which men are thus enabled to take in the work of their colleagues. The old Trinity tradition is that a Fellow should be an 'all-round' man, and the late Provost, Dr. Salmon—mathematician, theologian, man of letters—was, perhaps, the most remarkable embodiment of this tradition that the nineteenth century produced.

It is a hazardous thing to disturb methods of election which have worked, on the whole, very successfully; but it is open to question whether they are likely to prove equally beneficial in the future. The examination for Fellowship is now so severe, the courses so long, the competition so keen that men rarely succeed until their third or fourth attempt, and by that time they are near thirty years of age, if not older. The freshness of youth is gone before they enter upon their work; and, inasmuch as they are elected for life, and with the certainty that if they live long enough they will succeed as of right to a seat on the Board, irrespective of the reputation which they may have gained as teachers, or as investigators, or as scholars, there is always a danger—human nature being what it is—that they may content themselves with their first achievement, and treat their Fellowship as a hardly-won prize rather than as a profession which offers unexampled opportunities for further study. The Royal Commissioners will have to consider whether it would not be desirable to modify the present system if not by imposing an age limit on candidates, at any rate by reserving life Fellowships for men who have proved their capacity and their fitness for the duties of University life. Were the Governing Body reformed in such a way that its judgement in such matters would command public confidence, it would probably be well to entrust to it the power of electing Fellows without requiring them in every case to submit themselves to a competitive examination.



This would go far to improve the position of the Professors whose present status in Trinity is markedly inferior to that of the Fellows. Be a Professor never so brilliant, and his services never so important, he cannot, in existing circumstances, ever reach the dignity of Fellowship or a seat on the Board of the College, unless he has won his place by the ordeal of examination as a young man. This is felt by the professoriate to be a serious grievance, and it ought to be remedied should new statutes be drawn up.

The representation of the Professors as such upon the Governing Body would not only improve their status, but it would strengthen the Board by the presence of experts at its deliberations. We have already pointed out that much University business might with advantage be entrusted to syndicates of the several faculties, as is done at Oxford and Cambridge. This has become peculiarly necessary in the case of one important department, we mean the Divinity School, which was left by Fawcett's Act under the absolute control of the Board of the College. Before the passing of that Act, all Fellows were members of the Church of Ireland and a large majority were in Holy Orders. Thus the Governing Body of the school was composed of men who, by creed and by profession, were well fitted to oversee theological studies, and to select theological teachers. All this is now changed. There is no security that the members of the Board in future will be members of the Church of Ireland, or even favourably disposed to her interests. The College is being rapidly secularized by the diminution of the number of clerical Fellows and the subordinate place which is assigned in the college routine to theological instruction and to the chapel services. Attendance on 'catechetical' lectures is no longer obligatory even on Churchmen, and students are not required to go to chapel except on Sunday mornings in term. Chapel attendance on week-days is miserably small—the undergraduates naturally following the example of the Provost and resident Fellows by neglecting the daily offices. It is not surprising that the Church of Ireland has again and again expressed her dissatisfaction that the Divinity School should be under the control of a Board

whose secularizing policy is so apparent, and that she should have asked repeatedly through her bishops and through the General Synod that a Divinity School Council should be appointed, in whose decisions as to theological courses and religious discipline she could feel confidence. It is understood that a statement is to be laid before the Royal Commission on behalf of the Church, in which the anomalous condition of the Divinity School will be set forth.

It is important to observe that there is no demand for the separation of the Divinity School from the University, on the part of the Church or of the College or of the Roman Catholic bishops. The connexion between the two is beneficial to both—to the University, which would otherwise be without its most ancient faculty; to the Church, which holds it essential that her ministers should receive a liberal education. And it should be clearly understood that the Roman prelates, to their credit, have never asked that the Divinity School should be expelled from its present position in the University. There are, indeed, persons in Ireland who approve of the policy of promoting religious 'equality' by the simple process of extruding all recognition of religion from public life; and we are sorry to see that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church<sup>1</sup> have avowed their desire that the 'non-sectarian' character of Trinity should be vindicated by the removal of the Divinity School. This pronouncement was elicited by a liberal and generous offer of the Trinity authorities to sanction the establishment of a theological faculty in connexion with the Presbyterian Church, and to grant to Presbyterian students 'all the privileges at present enjoyed by members of the Church of Ireland.' The Presbyterians in Ireland believe that sufficient provision is made elsewhere for the theological training of their ministers, and because they are satisfied with theological colleges which have no University status, they hold that Churchmen should be forced to content themselves with similar institutions. The late Dr. Salmon's comment is worth quoting:

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1904, p. 809.*

'As for the terms of any union, we desire nothing but religious equality, provided it is obtained by levelling up, not by levelling down. We think it fair that members of other religions should enjoy any privilege which they covet that is already enjoyed by members of the Church of Ireland; but not that the latter should be deprived of any privilege which they have already, merely because members of other denominations do not desire to have it.'

This is, to our mind, an impregnable position; and we have every confidence that the Royal Commissioners will recognize that the maintenance of its theological faculty is essential to the completeness of the University, and that its exclusion would not gratify Roman Catholics at all; while it would be a grievous wrong to Irish Churchmen, who are, and must continue to be, the mainstay of Trinity College.

Nevertheless, if the theological faculty is to do its work efficiently, the Divinity School must be reorganized and placed under the control of a Council which is representative at once of theological learning and of the Church of Ireland. The Board of Trinity College have repeatedly, in former years, admitted that a new constitution must be devised for the school; but for some time past their attitude has been that of *non possumus*. It would, indeed, be obviously undesirable that a body like the General Synod should be given any voice in such matters as the choice of Professors or the ordering of courses of study. But what is needed is a Council of a strictly academic character, of which all the members shall be Churchmen, on which the principal Professors shall have seats, and on which, also, places are found for two or three of the bishops. So long as Dr. Salmon was Provost, the Divinity School was tolerably safe, for he understood its needs and its difficulties as well as any man. But since his death there has been no security that the school will be administered with due regard to the present condition of theology, or that vacancies in the teaching staff will be filled by the appointment of the best available men. The Fellows of Trinity can no longer supply even the minor posts in the school with advantage, for they are not now devoting themselves to the study of

theology, and it may be necessary to import men from Oxford or Cambridge to fill some of the more important posts. We trust that the statement to be laid before the Commission on behalf of the Church will make clear the inadequacy of the present system of government of the Divinity School, and that the Commissioners will give due recognition to the claim of theology to be a science, just as much as law or medicine, which cannot be advanced unless those who control the courses of study are equipped for their responsible duty by knowledge as well as by sympathy.

Trinity College, Dublin, has had a long and honourable history. It is the one British institution in Ireland which has been successful. Its services to science, to literature, to theology, have been very great. A hundred years ago it used to be called the 'Silent Sister' of the older foundations at Oxford and Cambridge; but its voice has not been silent during the last half century, and without the treatises which its leading men have produced in all departments of learning, the Republic of Letters would be the poorer. It stands in Ireland for learning, for freedom, and for religion in that form which commands the allegiance of the majority of the citizens of the Empire. To impair its usefulness or to cripple its resources in the interests of party politics, would be not only an enormous injustice but a blunder of the first magnitude. Like all other ancient institutions, its methods and its constitution need from time to time to be reorganized, and we have tried to point out some directions in which we believe that reform is desirable in the interests of learning. Similar reforms have long since been carried out at Oxford and Cambridge, to their great advantage; and we believe that Dublin University would be better enabled to carry on its career of usefulness to Ireland and to the Empire were the constitution of its Governing Body reconsidered. It seems to us to be anomalous and unsatisfactory, and we believe that were it suitably reformed all necessary changes in academic method would follow in due course. But we earnestly hope that no changes will be forced upon the University in the vain hope of conciliating its enemies by diminishing its resources.

They are all too meagre for its work, and whatever may be done for new institutions, we trust that it may not be at the expense of the great historic foundation of Trinity College, Dublin.

## SHORT NOTICES.

### I.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.

*Modern Criticism and the Book of Genesis.* By HENRY A. REDPATH, D.Litt., M.A. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1905.) Price 1s. 6d.

DR. REDPATH has taken Dr. Driver's commentary on Genesis as representing the type of criticism which he has generally in view. He is on the whole opposed to Dr. Driver's conclusions, and on some points he puts his case so well that his opponent may see fit to modify some of the words in which he has expressed himself; but he will find nothing in this book to shake his main positions—that Genesis, as we read it, is composed from written sources, that these written sources were considerably later than the time of Moses, and that in Genesis historical and scientific accuracy is not always to be found. Its religious value, Dr. Driver, of course, rates as highly as Dr. Redpath, and it cannot be allowed that any argument is here adduced which forbids him to do so. It is a defect in Dr. Redpath's treatment of the subject that he has modern criticism in general in his mind, while he devotes his particular attention to Dr. Driver; for every now and then he breaks away from his individual opponent, without due warning that he does so, and thus gives unintentionally the impression that Dr. Driver defends opinions which he does not defend. A more serious defect is the limitation of the inquiry to Genesis alone, and the complete avoidance of the wider questions of Hexateuchal criticism. The inconvenience of this course is acknowledged, but cannot be justified. The literary analysis of Genesis is dependent on the examination of the whole Hexateuch, and the dating of the several sources is dependent on a comparison with the whole history of Israel and the whole literature of the Old Testament. No objections to this analysis and dating which leave out of account that wider field can have much weight. Moreover it must be confessed that

the complex argument of modern literary criticism, tested and corrected by so many generations of advocates and opponents, cannot be seriously discussed in a book of ninety-one small pages, which are chiefly devoted to a selection of details, and give no consideration to the whole plan.

Not that this book is by any means useless. It contains many acute observations, but is, we think, especially to be commended for containing a timely protest against a perverted theory of compilation. 'A historian,' says Dr. Redpath, 'can take those sources and construct from them a harmonious whole, which, however, will still bear traces of its origin. This is the natural process,' and is opposed to what he calls 'a paste-and-scissors method.' The former he believes to be the method by which the historian of Genesis worked; and here we agree. We cannot understand how Dr. Redpath can assign the early date he does to the sources of Genesis; his attempt to absolve Genesis from all historical and scientific error, while at the same time he allows that the record is not scientific in language nor properly chronological, seems to labour under just the same difficulties as Philo's contention that all Greek philosophy is implicit in the Mosaic law; his fear lest the idea of 'an evolutionary process' in 'religious belief' should contradict the tradition that 'the first man' was 'in close communion and intercourse with a God, to connect whom with totemism, fetichism, or animism would be arrant blasphemy,' seems to involve a particular form of the idea of evolution in religion which no literary criticism obliges us to accept; but none the less we consider him quite right in claiming intelligent, conscientious judgement for the historian or historians who composed from inferior and confused material the noble narrative of Genesis.

No one, it is true, can work at the analysis of the Hexateuch without perceiving that the method of its composition was much less free than that of a modern author. It is a method which cannot be described, but might be caricatured, by the epithet 'paste-and-scissors.' The construction of 'a harmonious whole' (to say the least) has evidently been kept in view, and Dr. Redpath might have insisted even more than he does on this point. For though he takes pains to prove that glaring contradictions need not be found in the narrative of Genesis, even though some slight discrepancies are visible upon the surface, he does not use this proof to confirm his defence of the author's historical method, but infers from it something



else which does not really follow—namely, that the author has been divinely saved from falling into any actual error of history or science, however nearly the vagueness of his expression may seem to approach to error. It is impossible to assent to this if we put the plain, natural meaning upon the language of Genesis. To suggest, as Dr. Redpath does, that the serpent in Eden spoke by 'speaking looks,' is not natural and does not help to the understanding of the story. This is one of many instances where he gives an explanation which is not needed of a difficulty which is really no difficulty. He misunderstands, we are convinced, the aim and character of the sacred historian. Allow that he was an intelligent historian, using materials which needed selection, criticism, and correction. Allow further that he had a good judgement and a conscientious determination to reach truth of every kind as nearly as he could. Then it may be held that the answer from God to his conscientious endeavour, his thought, his research, his anxious candour, his prayer, was inspiration. A writer thus inspired may err in this or that place as to history, science, or even as to religion. He may repeat or remodel some stories which he never meant to be read otherwise than as myths or poetry. None the less his book may carry a genuine revelation of God. It may be that later generations will be able to go farther than he penetrated in the discovery of the truths to which he pointed. When a book is of such a kind as to beget that power in later readers it is often said 'to live,' and when a book thus lives which is concerned with the highest truth, it is called, and is, *inspired*. What Bengel said of textual criticism may be also applied to the studies which Dr. Redpath and his opponents pursue with unity of devotion in spite of differences of opinion: *Ipsa summa in libris omnibus salva est ex Dei providentia: sed tamen illam ipsam providentiam non debemus eo allegare ut a lima quam accuratissima deterreamur. . . quaelibet aetas pro sua facultate veritatem investigare et amplecti fidelitatemque in minimis et maximis praestare debet.*

*A Critical Commentary on Genesis ii. 4.-iii. 25.* By H. H. B. AYLES, D.D. (London: Clay and Sons, 1904.) Price 5s.

THOUGH Dr. Ayles takes us over familiar ground, he has several things to say which are worthy of attention. The object of this section is not, he considers, to give a second account of the creation, but to deal with the temptation and fall of man. According to the Jehovist, man received his knowledge through

VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

N

the woman; the two trees in Paradise represent the choice offered to him—knowledge if he wished to have descendants, life if he wished to be immortal: if he chose the latter, there was no need to multiply his race; if the former, men could no longer be immortal. Dr. Ayles points out, what apparently the Assyriologists have missed, the source of this conception of the Jehovist, the Babylonian legend of Gilgamesh. There the man obtains his knowledge from a woman, who teaches him not of her own initiative, but prompted by another; the tree of life is guarded by awful beings; the man is prevented from eating of it and dies. In order to get rid of the idea that man became like God through disobeying God's command, Dr. Ayles renders Gen. iii. 22 'the man was like one of us'; it is true that the Hebrew verb *hayah* may mean 'to be' or 'to become'; but in this case the meaning is decided by v. 5, as all the versions naturally perceived. Dr. Ayles has to force the plain sense of v. 5 and to give what we think is an incorrect interpretation of the context; the Jehovist does not say that man *was* like God before the Fall, and possessed immortality (p. 19). There is a good note on the site of Paradise, nothing new in that on the Name 'Yahweh.' The discussions in the appendix are slight and sketchy, and not to be compared with Dr. Driver's exhaustive additional notes in his commentary on Genesis.

*Expositions of Holy Scripture. The Book of Genesis.* By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D., Litt.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.) Price 7s. 6d.

THERE is no striving after new ideas in Dr. Maclaren's exposition; wisdom, not cleverness, is its characteristic. Like the greater artists he tells the truth simply, and guides the reader by a plain path through the book of Genesis, bringing old lessons home to the conscience and inspiring them with life. His treatment of the 'Bad Bargain' (as he entitles it) of Esau may be taken as an illustration. Nearly everyone tries to say something new about Esau, and too often the meaning of the sacred historian is missed in the attempt. Dr. Maclaren keeps to the text, and with many patient, orderly touches impresses the lesson on the reader that

'it is base to live for flesh, either in more refined or in more frankly coarse forms. It is base to be incapable of seeing an inch beyond the present. It is base to despise any good that cannot minister to fleeting lusts or fleshly pleasures, and to say of high thought, of ideal aims of any sort, and most of all to say of religion, "What good will it do me?"'

This truth is often told, but Dr. Maclaren so prepares the way for it, and so presents it in the proper place, that the reader takes it to heart and acknowledges that it is to be acted upon. And then, as he reads further, he finds continual encouragement.

'There is no mystery in getting to the journey's end. "One foot up and the other foot down," continued long enough, will bring to the goal of the longest march. It looks a weary journey, and we wonder if we shall ever get thither. But the magic of "one step at a time" does it. The guide is also the upholder of our way. "Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion."'

This verse from the Psalter is a favourite with the author, and his familiar pleasure in it should be remembered when his doctrine—or, as he would no doubt prefer it expressed, his treatment of the Scriptural doctrine—of 'separation' is considered. To this doctrine he frequently reverts. It contains the truth which he evidently believes to be most needed by this generation. He gladly encourages, but he also arouses grave misgivings, as he certainly has desired to do.

'Do you care to detach yourself from the world? or are you really "men of this world, which have their portion in this life," even while Christians by profession? A question which I have no right to ask, and no power to answer but for myself; a question which it concerns your souls to ask and to answer very definitely for yourselves. . . . times are changed now. What we want to-day is: "Come ye out and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." In my conscience I believe that multitudes are having the very heart of the Christian life eaten out by absorption in earthly pursuits and loves, and by the effacing of all distinction in outward life, in occupation, in recreation, in tastes and habits, between people who call themselves Christians and people who do not care at all whether there is another world or not. There can be but little strength in our faith if it does not compel us to separation.'

Is it possible to read these stern sentences and feel quite comfortable? Can it be doubted that Dr. Maclaren is on the whole right? And yet, what does he wish done? By asking these questions we would indicate what we believe to be the chief strength and weakness of the book. As the series of fine expositions is marred by the insertion here and there of mere sermon notes, hints thrown out and not elaborated; as the homely, dignified language is now and again interrupted by a preacher's conventional phrases, such as 'out-and-out religious men,' 'stretch out our hands across the ages,' 'the soft rustle of angel wings and the brightness from the flashing armour of the heavenly hosts,' so this doctrine, stern, but full of a far-reaching hope, and so difficult to grasp in all the due proportion of its parts,

is often proclaimed, but nowhere sufficiently explained, and just where the difficulty of expression begins the reader too often finds himself put off, as it were, with a phrase. He is called upon to 'answer very definitely' for himself as to his own position towards 'the world,' but it is difficult to answer definitely, difficult to define this 'world,' and, though he is warned, he is not much helped in the task. Does Dr. Maclaren's paraphrase of *ἐξωθεν μάχαι*, 'without are *fighters*,' suggest that he has himself missed part of the Scriptural doctrine? 'Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood,' said St. Paul; 'I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one,' said our Lord. Was there, indeed, that 'infinite gulf' between John Knox and 'the criminal, perhaps a murderer,' with whom 'he was fastened to the same oar'? Or is 'infinite' here but a pulpit word, not accurately expressive of the preacher's profounder reconciliation of truth and charity?

This criticism does not all affect the solid merit of the book. It excels most books of the kind. Genesis is one of the Church's richest treasuries of truth. If anyone would learn from it, he could not do better than read these expositions, unless he will indeed adventure more, and, in the author's own spirit, so far separate himself from the fashion of the day as to go directly to the sacred text and meditate upon it for himself.

*The Book of the Covenant in Moab.* By John CULLEN, M.A., D.Sc. (Glasgow: MacLehose and Sons.) Price 5s. net.

THIS is a solid and independent contribution to the literary criticism of Deuteronomy, and deserves to be carefully weighed. Most critics regard chs. v.-xxvi. as the work of a single author, and chs. v.-xi. as an introduction to the main topic of the book, the Deuteronomic legislation. Dr. Cullen, however, attempts to shew that this conclusion is unsound. He finds two chief documents in Deuteronomy, 'The Book of the Covenant in Moab,' designated 'The Commandment,' consisting roughly of chs. v.-xi. with prologue and epilogue, and 'The Law-code,' designated 'The Torah,' chs. xii.-xxv. with prologue and epilogue. The distinction between these two documents is marked by a difference in the point of view and by certain, in our opinion not very decisive, differences of style. In v.-xi. we have a renewal of the covenant of Horeb, made when Israel is supposed to have reached Moab, on the borders of the Promised Land; under a thin disguise this document was put out to prepare the way for the reformation under Josiah; the main

question with the author is, will Israel destroy the whole apparatus of heathen worship and decide for Jahveh? In contrast to the false gods, Jahveh is One: will Israel be faithful? Then, a little later, the Law-code was issued, consisting of xii.-xxv., with an appropriate setting; here the chief topic is the centralization of the cultus; the writer insists not upon the abolition of the false worship, but upon the establishment of the true. When in the course of time these two documents were combined, a good deal of re-arrangement and modification became necessary, and the Law-code, being of urgent practical importance, came to dominate the whole Deuteronomic publication. The separate and earlier origin of the Covenant-book was thus obscured. In working out a somewhat intricate hypothesis Dr. Cullen undoubtedly draws attention to a good many points which are apt to be overlooked; in chs. i.-iv. and xxix.-xxxiv. especially there is plenty of room for fresh suggestions; but we cannot say that we are entirely convinced by his main contention, viz. that v.-xi. originally existed as a separate document, independent of xii.-xxvi.; and we cannot believe that Ex. xxiv. 4-8 formed the original conclusion of Deut. v.-xi. Nevertheless, Dr. Cullen's experiment is a valuable one and full of interest.

*The Maid of Shulam.* By Hugh Falconer, B.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.) Price 3s. 6d.

MR. FALCONER, recognizing the beauty of the Song even when read in its plain, literal sense, and believing that some mystical sense, hard perhaps to grasp but important, is also involved in it, attempts in this little introduction to restore a too much neglected piece of Scripture to its rightful place. He is justified in his attempt because he believes he can put the mystical interpretation on a safer basis than has generally been done. Hitherto, 'unsupported by a definite story,' it has 'lacked lucidity and regulative idea'; while, on the other hand, those who have traced the story more firmly have lacked sympathy with its elusive, varying symbolism. On the whole he has done his task well, though we doubt whether the need was quite so pressing, whether the short commentary, for instance, of Dr. Andrew Harper in the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools' (which he praises) would not supply all the guidance needed by a meditative mind, even though its meditations were to carry it farther than Dr. Harper goes.

An introductory chapter, called 'Idyll and Type,' explains

the story of the song as it has generally been explained since Ewald's time. A Shulamite maiden carried off by Solomon to his palace resists his flatteries and the persuasions of the ladies of his Court, and remains true to her shepherd lover, the hero of the poem, concerning whom she discourses poetry of great beauty, and with whom she returns at last to her village home. This is followed by a translation, divided into scenes, each of which is introduced by a short explanation, and the lines are distributed among the different speakers—the maid, the chorus of ladies, Solomon, and finally the shepherd lover. The translation is free, and by its freedom gains vigour and natural grace. As an example of its quality we will quote a few lines from Chapter VI. :

' I had gone down to the walnut garden,  
To look on the green growth of the valley,  
To see if the vine were budding,  
And the pomegranates were in flower.  
Little recked I my quest would set me  
Among chariots of princes.  
"Come back," they cried, "come back, O Shulamite,  
Come back, come back, that we may gaze on thee."  
"Would ye gaze," I said, "on the Shulamite  
As on a dance at Mahanaim ? " "

In some places, however, a little more accuracy might be desirable. The rendering of vii. 7, 'Among all the delights how fair and how passing pleasant is love,' makes it impossible to doubt whether 'love' means the emotion or the loved person, but the ambiguity is avoided at the cost of substituting third for second persons in two verbs. This is a trifle. It annoys the slightly pedantic reader in the same way as the use of 'crest' for 'arms' in another place. 'Dante's crest might serve as a figure of the Shulamite's life—a golden eagle on a field of azure.' But one liberty has been taken which may be more misleading. Different Hebrew words were employed by the author for 'friend' or 'beloved one,' and it would be a confirmation of the plan by which the distribution of lines is regulated if it could be shewn that one of these terms is used exclusively by Solomon. As a matter of fact, this is so nearly the case that the confirmation may be granted; but there are two exceptions, ii. 10 and 13, where Solomon's word רֵעִי is used by the shepherd lover. Mr. Falconer, however, translates this word by the somewhat cold and conventional 'dear one' throughout Solomon's speeches, but in these two verses varies



the translation to 'beloved' and 'love.' One other point of language must be touched upon. Mr. Falconer's design is little affected by questions of textual or historical criticism, and he avoids them on the whole, but not absolutely. In more than one place he returns to the proof of the Solomonic date of the composition. Now the chief difficulty about that date is the language, which must indicate either that the Song is late, or that it arose in some part of Palestine where a dialect was spoken in which certain characteristics of the later language were anticipated. Mr. Falconer takes for granted that there was such a dialect in Northern Israel, and argues from the assumption as if it were a proved fact. 'The style,' he writes, 'with its peculiar form of the relative pronoun, may readily be explained by the hypothesis that the Song was composed in North Palestine, the dialect of which was akin to Aramaic.' This is not a correct way of stating the case, and it is necessary that attention should be called to the inaccuracy; but we do not lay stress upon it, for the date does not affect the purpose of his book, and it is a pity that Mr. Falconer should have discussed it.

That purpose is attained by the translation with its analysis, and by the chapters which follow, 'The Song and Nature,' 'The Song and Human Nature,' and 'The Song and its Over-tones.' The last of these is the best. The two former are prettily done, and bring out well the youthful freshness of the poem, and the nobility of the Shulamite's character; but they are not sufficiently masculine in thought, nor do they keep close enough to the text to mark out a firm path for the meditative student. When we read that 'with the Shulamite experimental religion precedes morality, and ethical obedience follows love,' we cannot but ask whether this really is part of the 'evident didactic value' which the Song 'interpreted as literature' possesses. That it does teach us to recognize the divine relationships in Nature and in human love, and, even though it went no farther than that, would still point to Christ, is perfectly true; we agree with Mr. Falconer in finding yet a deeper doctrine. The title of his last chapter prepares the reader for his manner of treating the mystical element; and here he is excellent. 'Rabbinical tradition,' he writes, 'the familiar symbolism of the prophets, and the well-known custom of poets in the East to shadow religious truths under figures of earthly love, may tend to persuade us that the author of the Song probably wrote it as a parable of spiritual things.' Those

who object to such an idea as 'in some ways detrimental to the austere purity of faith' receive this reasonable answer: 'Perhaps they forget that the devout heart, conscious of spiritual reality, relegates the symbol to a very subordinate place, just as the mind ceases to notice a mirror when absorbed in contemplation of the object it reflects.' Mr. Falconer considers, as all who adopt Ewald's view of the story must, that the shepherd lover, not Solomon, symbolizes the divine Lover of Israel and of the soul, but the strength of his mystical exposition lies in his keeping strictly to the idea of a symbolic rather than an allegorical meaning. The Song is 'an exquisitely sympathetic interpreter of the varying moods and tenses of the devout life.' Its deeper message is formed and re-formed in the heart of each reader. To fix a hard, limited significance to each detail of the still living poem would spoil all. 'The canticle is like some note of music, exquisite in itself, yet still more enchanting because of the deep undertones or high overtones which it suggests to the listening ear . . . its chords of human affection pass into the complex music of earth's sublimest symphony—the converse of loyal and loving hearts with the God of Redemption.'

*Studies in the Sermon on the Mount.* By the Rev. the Hon. E. LYTTLETON, M.A. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1905.) Price 12s. net.

THESE *Studies* by the headmaster of Eton are a serious attempt to draw out the meaning of our Lord's teaching. They are evidently not intended for, and they are not likely to be useful to, hasty and careless readers. Those who bestow time and thought on them will find themselves repaid. In some respects the Sermon on the Mount is the most difficult part of the New Testament, and the book before us does not remove the difficulties. But it is eminently calculated to help educated and thoughtful readers to appreciate the lines of interpretation on which the practical understanding of our Lord's discourse may be greatly increased. The author himself says of it that it 'is not intended to be taken up and read through, but to be consulted by anyone who may be studying particular subjects or passages.' We would add that a student of the New Testament who would read a short piece of this book daily, and then ponder for a while on the passage on which the part he has read is based, might find that his insight into our Lord's teaching was materially and fruitfully enlarged and deepened by the time he had finished the book.

## II. DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

*Confession and Absolution. The Teaching of the Church of England, as interpreted and illustrated by the Writings of the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century.* By T. W. DRURY, B.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.) Price 6s.

IN the preface to this book Mr. Drury calls attention to the fact that the 'object and scope' 'are strictly defined by the title.' His purpose has been not to write a general treatise about Confession and Absolution, or to discuss on the widest and fullest grounds the position of the Church of England in regard to it; but, as he says, 'to illustrate the formularies of our Church from the writings of the men who were most concerned in compiling them.' As a discussion of the teaching of the reformers of the sixteenth century the work possesses very high value. It treats of the writers in question with the care and accuracy and fairness and clear statement which we expect to find in anything written by Mr. Drury. It may be taken as a good guide by those who wish to know the teaching of the sixteenth-century reformers on this subject, and have not opportunity for first-hand study of their own.

In some respects Mr. Drury's book is fitted for an Eirenicon. He lays stress on that aspect of the views of the reformers in which they regard Absolution as some kind of authoritative declaration of the pardon of God as well as of readmission to the privileges of the Church. He admits 'the value of Confession in time of need,' and allows that Confession has some place in the system of the reformed Church of England. The whole tone and temper of his book are as far as possible removed from the controversial and unfair handling of the subject with which we are too familiar.

We have mentioned that the stress laid on Absolution as an authoritative declaration supplies a point for an Eirenicon. The opinion of Peter Lombard that 'the power of loosing and binding granted to priests is of shewing men as bound or loosed,'<sup>1</sup> the definition of Absolution by the Council of Trent as a 'judicial act,'<sup>2</sup> and the teaching of the Church of England that God has 'given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins,'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xviii. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. can. 9, De Sanctissimo Poenitentiae Sacramento.

<sup>3</sup> It is important to notice that the words include 'power' as well as 'commandment,' 'pronounce' as well as 'declare.'

afford different sides of a line of thought which may well be fruitful in the interests of peace.

Another point for an Eirenicon to which we have referred is the assertion of 'the value of Confession in time of need' and the allowance of the lawfulness of Confession in the English Church. A necessary condition for any hopeful discussion of Confession in the Church of England is the acknowledgment on the one side that the attitude of the Church of England is wholly different from the mediæval requirement of Confession 'at least once in the year' from 'all the faithful of both sexes after they have attained years of discretion,'<sup>1</sup> and on the other side that it differs no less completely from the polemical 'Protestantism' which would cast Confession out of the Christian system as an evil thing.

Yet there are elements lacking in Mr. Drury's book, the presence of which would, in our opinion, make it more hopeful from the point of view from which we have been considering it. The force and significance of a judicial pronouncement of the pardon of God are, we think, greater than, so far as we can gather, he is disposed to allow. The position of Confession in the formularies of the Church of England is more prominent than his book by itself would suggest. He does not appear to have realized how much is involved in the fact that the Church of England has taken pains to secure that no Churchman shall approach Communion or be visited by serious illness without an opportunity of Confession being placed within his reach and brought to his notice. The Prayer Book is explicit that the 'warning' which invites to Confession those who cannot otherwise quiet their own consciences is 'always' to be read 'upon the Sunday, or some Holy-day immediately preceding' the celebration of the Holy Communion, and that in the visitation of the sick 'the sick person' is to 'be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.'

Further, a book the subject of which is limited to 'the writings of the reformers of the sixteenth century' must necessarily be seriously incomplete for the purposes of practical usefulness as distinct from academical study. The writings and practice of English divines and Church people in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are of no less importance than those of an earlier time; and part of the evidence derived from these tends towards a fuller idea of the benefit of Absolution and a more habitual use of Confession

<sup>1</sup> Fourth Lateran Council, cap. 21: *cf.* Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. can. 8, *De Sanctissimo Poenitentiae Sacramento.*

than that from the sixteenth-century reformers.<sup>1</sup> Where, as was the case in the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the object was to include in one Communion persons who agreed on central truths but disagreed on much that was derived and subordinate, the guarded language of official formularies often cannot rightly be read in the light of the private opinions of those who were mainly responsible for it. It is important to remember the wider appeal of the Church of England, never quite out of sight, and given explicit utterance in the injunction of the canons of 1571, that preachers should 'teach nothing in their sermons which they should require to be devoutly held or believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected out of that said doctrine,' in Canon xxx. of 1603, and in the Preface to the Prayer Book of 1662. Patristic evidence, which tends to support the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas, that in Absolution there is an actual remission of sins,<sup>2</sup> rather than the view of Peter Lombard, that Absolution in regard to sins is not more than an authoritative pronouncement of a state of soul already existing,<sup>3</sup> must be taken into account.<sup>4</sup> In saying this, we are not finding fault with Mr. Drury for not including matters which did not fall within the scope of his book, but simply pointing out that the subject which he discusses only covers a very small part of the ground.

The number of mistakes and minor blemishes which we have noticed is very small. Among them the following may be mentioned. The warning against Waterland's statements on 'the progressive character of justification and forgiveness,' ignores that the relation of the soul to God ought to be one of progress, and that, as penitence and faith grow, man's reception of God's grace is strengthened and deepened. The statement that 'Baptism gives us the covenant right to pardon upon repentance all our lives,' does not settle the question whether any step is necessary if we are to avail ourselves of that right. When Bellarmine's words, 'without their [*i.e.* of the priests] judgment no one who has fallen into sin after baptism can be reconciled,' are referred to as different from 'the more exact doctrine' by which 'the schoolmen limited this necessity to mortal sins after baptism,' it is forgotten that Bellarmine is considering the case of

<sup>1</sup> The references and instances in Cooke, *The Power of the Priesthood in Absolution*, second edition, will repay study.

<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* III. lxxxiv. 3, ad 5.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sent.* IV. xviii. 5, 6.

<sup>4</sup> See, *e.g.*, St. Ambrose, *De Poen.* i. 36, ii. 19; St. Chrysostom, *De Sacerd.* iii. 5, 6.

those who have committed mortal sins, and that so far as he regarded the confession of all sins as necessary, the necessity was viewed as disciplinary and not as inherent, as is clear when consideration is given to the context in which the sentence quoted by Mr. Drury occurs, to the general argument of the chapter, and to the fact that the object of Bellarmine's contention is to defend the action of the Council of Trent.<sup>1</sup> The assertion that 'the authorized statement of the Church of Rome' makes 'the acts of the penitent the matter of this sacrament,' and the acceptance of Hooker's statement that 'the Council of Trent gave solemn approbation' to the Thomist view of the form and matter in penance fail to account for the facts that the natural inference from the proceedings of the Council of Trent<sup>2</sup> is that the particular phrase eventually adopted by the Council, describing the acts of the penitent as *quasi materia*,<sup>3</sup> was deliberately chosen with the intention of not excluding the Scotist view, which regards the Absolution as both matter and form, and that, though the Catechism of the Council<sup>4</sup> and some influential theologians<sup>5</sup> interpret the phrase differently, this natural inference from the proceedings of the Council is confirmed by the teaching of other Roman Catholic writers of position and weight.<sup>6</sup> To say that 'the schoolmen insisted on the necessity of the words *Ego absolvo te* as essential to the form of the Sacrament,' does not allow for the differing views of different schoolmen, and in particular for the opinion of Scotus that, while the phrase *Ego absolvo te* is usual and suitable, it is not necessary for the words in penance to be so strictly circumscribed as the form in baptism.<sup>7</sup> Mr. Drury assumes that in the pre-Reformation English Church there was no public confession of the communicants before Communion parallel to that provided in the ceremonial directions at the beginning of the present Roman Missal and now used in the Church of Rome. If he knows of evidence that this was so, he would have done well to state it. He fails to grasp the significance of the changes made in the Office of the Visitation of the Sick in the Prayer Book of 1662.

<sup>1</sup> See Bellarmine, *De Poenitentia*, iii. 2; and cf. Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. cap. 5, can. 6, 7, 8, *De Sanctissimo Poenitentiae Sacramento*.

<sup>2</sup> See Theiner, *Acta Genuina SS. Oec. Conc. Trident.* i. 531-601.

<sup>3</sup> Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. cap. 3, can. 4, *De Sanc. Poen. Sacr.*

<sup>4</sup> *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, II. v. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* Suarez, *In part. tert. disp.* xviii. 2 (3); De Lugo, *De Sacr. Poen.* xii. 2; Bellarmine, *De Poen.* i. 15, 17.

<sup>6</sup> *E.g.* Maldonatus, *De Poen.* ii. 7; Lehmkühl, *Theologia Moralis*, ii. 256; Schanz, *Die Lehre von den heiligen Sacramenten*, p. 537; Wilhelm and Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology*, ii. 466.

<sup>7</sup> Duns Scotus, *Sent.* IV. xiv. 4.



*The Appeal of the Church of England : an Examination of our Principles and Positions in the Light of History.* By ARTHUR GALTON. With a Preface by HENRY WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. (London : Dover Street Book Store, 1905.) Price 2s. net.

VALUABLE work might be done by a competent writer who would carefully examine and explain the nature of the appeal made to primitive Christianity by the Church of England, and the actual character of the Church doctrine and life of such a period as the first six centuries. But no help is afforded by polemical writing like that found in the controversial book which Mr. Galton has published under the title *The Appeal of the Church of England*. Happily, the English Church is not bound by the foolish challenge of Bishop Jewel which forms Mr. Galton's starting-point. Whatever may have been the case in Jewel's time, too much is now known about the period of the first six centuries to make it possible for any wise man who has taken the trouble to ascertain the facts to bind himself to accept a doctrine or practice for the support of which 'one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church' can be found. Jewel's rashness was as far as possible removed from the caution of the official utterances of the Church of England ; and as regards such an appeal in general other English divines write in a different strain. Nor is Mr. Galton any happier in his treatment of the early Church than he is in that of the appeal of the Church of England. He does not even attempt to set out any clear idea of what the early Church was like, but contents himself with thin and slipshod and inaccurate statements, misleading to readers who are not already acquainted with the facts.

The five pages of Dr. Wace's preface, as might be expected, are of a much abler character than the book which they are intended to commend ; and it is to be regretted that he has not himself undertaken the task of an adequate presentation of the evidence as to the ideas about antiquity found in the post-Reformation English Church, and as to the teaching of antiquity. A work from his pen could hardly fail to be very different from Mr. Galton's useless book, though we do not think any fair and exhaustive handling would support the opinions he is usually understood to hold. Indeed, the unreality of the whole 'appeal' on the part of those who have been chiefly responsible for it

seems to us shewn by the entire difference between—to mention but one point among many—the view of the Sacraments held by them and that indicated by the universality of Infant Confirmation and Infant Communion and the Fast before Communion in the early Church.

*Church Principles; or, The Scriptural Teaching of the British Churches.* By JOHN COMPER, late Rector of St. Margaret's, Aberdeen, and for fifty-one years Priest of the Scottish Church. With a Preface by R. M. BENSON, M.A., S.S.J.E., Student of Christ Church, Oxford; and a Memoir by J. WISEMAN, M.A., Rector of Bucksburn. (London: Elliot Stock, 1904.) Price 5s.

THIS volume contains a series of nine lectures delivered in 1851 and first published in 1854 by Mr. Comper, together with a preface by Father Benson, and a memoir by Mr. Wiseman. It will be valued by many in Scotland and elsewhere as a memento of so respected a priest as Mr. Comper. The lectures have further value as a clear and systematic exposition of the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments, which is found in a more difficult form in the well-known books by the late Archdeacon Wilberforce. Here and there the lectures might have been improved by the 'few alterations in style' which Mr. Comper's death prevented him from making as he had intended. For instance, in one place the validity of Baptism administered outside the Catholic Church appears to be denied, while in another it is said to be doubtful, and the usual opinion as to its validity is alluded to in a note; it can hardly be said now that the word *ἐκκλησία* 'signifies a body of persons called out or chosen from among others into a separate, visible community or fellowship'; the assertion, 'Wherever His Divinity is present, there also, by a moral necessity, is His Manhood,' needs some qualification; and the words 'alone' and 'only' in the sentence 'Seek Him in the one fellowship where alone He abides, and in His Sacraments through which only He communicates Himself to men,' are not altogether in harmony with other statements in the lectures. These small points lessen, though they do not destroy, the usefulness of a valuable book.

*The Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles.* The Croall Lecture for 1892. By the late W. HASTIE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Edited by W. FULTON. With a prefatory note by Professor FLINT. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1904.) Price 4s. 6d. net.

THE long delay since these lectures were delivered in the Tron Kirk of Edinburgh is accounted for partly by the fact that Dr. Hastie had

other work in hand, and partly by his desire to use his materials again in his Glasgow chair. By the Reformed Church Dr. Hastie means such Protestantism as sprang from the work of Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox. He excludes Lutheranism, and as for the Church of England, a vital portion of the Catholic Church which protests against the modern ideas of Papal jurisdiction and the modern accretions of Papal doctrine and practice, he makes us understand quite clearly that he regards her as having fallen from the purity of Reformed principles. The introductory lecture, or chapter, as Mr. Fulton has called it, contains an historical survey of the subject, including a notice of the Ritschlian theology. The second lecture points out the difference between the Lutheran body and the Reformed Church, as Dr. Hastie understands it, and lays stress on the Protestant principle as a Church-reforming principle. When this principle is applied to 'present ecclesiastical relations,' as is done in the third lecture, we see at once how different is the standpoint of Dr. Hastie from that of the Church of England, and it is here that the chief interest of the volume lies for our readers.

Dr. Hastie opens this part of his work with the well-worn reference to 'the concessions regarding the origin and development of Episcopacy made by Dr. Lightfoot,' and, as usual in such references, does not refer to the several later occasions on which the Bishop of Durham endeavoured to correct erroneous inferences drawn from his original essay on the Christian ministry. 'During the first age of the Reformation the Church of Cranmer maintained no such view as that of a special divine institution of Episcopacy, nor did it claim the right to repudiate the ordination of the other Reformed Churches, and reordain any of their ministers who joined the communion of the Church of England. On the contrary, the orders of the other Reformed Churches were fully recognised, and their ministers were admitted to the highest offices and functions in the Church of England without the idea of the necessity of reordination at Episcopal hands being yet dreamed of.' This extract appears to us to be at direct variance with the facts of history which underlie the preface to the Ordinal and the wording of the 36th Article. But whatever be its value, 'the Church of England has changed since then, and even alienated itself from the communion of the Reformed Churches,' and Dr. Hastie mourns over 'the fundamental alteration in polity,' advocated and inaugurated by Bancroft and carried out by Laud. The name of Laud rouses Dr. Hastie to speak of him as 'the real founder of High Churchism, with all its narrowness and pretentiousness, which has no deeper basis as a theory of corporeal spirituality than continuation or imitation of Romanism and the

servile sycophancy of ambitious archbishops.' That passage again does not strike us as an accurate summary of the facts set forth in Le Bas' *Life of Laud*, still in some ways the best account of the 'brain-force' of that remarkable man. His work was consummated, for good or ill, at all events in perpetuity, for the Church of England in 1662. 'From that day till now,' proceeds Dr. Hastie, 'the Church of England, with all its proud pretensions and claims to Catholicity, has been, in the view of the historian, the narrowest, the most exclusive, and the most schismatic Church in Western Christendom.' She has shut her gates 'to the ministers of all the other Protestant Churches who are unable to abjure the sanctity of their ordination, and pass under the humiliating yoke of a new Episcopal ordination.'

It is hardly necessary to give detailed illustration of the view which Dr. Hastie takes of that revival of Church life which began in 1833, with which the *Church Quarterly Review*, in its ancestry and its history, has been so closely connected. Dr. Hastie speaks of the 'exploded sophistry' of the Tractarian party, of the 'weak and narrow minds' of the Anglo-Catholic divines, of their 'poor schoolboy translation work that is equally void of historical insight and masterly judgment,' of the 'struggling and but half emancipated thought of the Greek and Latin Fathers' contained in 'the boasted patristic literature, the last refuge and resort of Anglo-Catholicism.' We must not and need not illustrate further, and if we pass by two lectures on the theological principle of the divine sovereignty and the anthropological principle of religious development, it is only to leave room to refer to the last lecture on the principle of absolute predestination. There is a grim irony in the note which Professor Flint adds to his preface to say that he does not believe in the metaphysical predestination of Augustine or Calvin or the Synod of Dort.

*The Westminster Confession of Faith and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England: the Legal, Moral, and Religious Aspects of the Subscription to them.* By JAMES DONALDSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of the University of St. Andrews. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1905.) Price 3s. 6d.

THE occasion of this short work is the Free Church of Scotland Appeals of 1903-4. The importance which attaches to it is mainly the authority of the writer's name. Dr. Donaldson devotes a chapter by the way to the legal decision itself, in which he seeks to convict its authors of 'ignorance of Scotch history and Scotch institutions,' and a concluding chapter deals with the creed of the Minority Free Church, which is of little interest

to the general reader. But the main motive of the book is the desire to offer some suggestions towards removing the alleged difficulties that beset subscription in the Established Churches of England and Scotland. We should be inclined to demur to the parallel which others before Dr. Donaldson have drawn between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession. That it was precisely the so-called Calvinistic articles at which the divines of 1647 stumbled is, of course, notorious. But the main point of difference is that while the Confession is, as its name implies, a creed, the Anglican document is 'articles agreed upon' as a safeguard of public teaching. The declaration of assent, which has been in use since 1865, and which is quite in conformity with the history and nature of the Articles, is very different from the formula in which every minister of the Scottish Establishment declares the Confession of Faith to be 'the confession of my faith.' But Dr. Donaldson applies his argument to the Three Creeds themselves, and here we can only say that his reasoning is of a kind with which we are all sufficiently familiar, and which really defeats its own end by rendering all religious association on the basis of united conviction practically impossible.

The constructive part of this essay, as indeed might almost be anticipated, is the most disappointing. The attempt to frame a new creed is deprecated because of the inherent difficulties of the task. A 'Declaratory Act' (and here the case of Scotland is alone considered) referring the signatory back to 'Holy Scripture interpreted by the Holy Spirit' is held to be equally unsatisfactory, because it misses the main point at issue, viz. the validity of this authority. What seems to find most favour with the writer is to leave matters of doctrine to be determined in Scotland by the General Assembly, in England by the Convocations, though, if the assent of Parliament is to be obtained, there must be a redistribution of ancient endowments on some principle which dissociates their use from dogmatic subscription. But this leaves the real problem still untouched.

*Home Reunion Notes.* By EARL NELSON. (London: John Murray, 1905.) Price 6s. net.

A VOLUME of Essays on Home Reunion by the veteran leader of the Home Reunion Society is of special interest at this time, when, through the Nonconformist majority in the Commons, Nonconformity is so openly becoming political rather than

VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

O

religious. The second title of this volume describes it as an appeal for a better mutual understanding, and the information which Earl Nelson has here collected of recent utterances and movements, with his comments upon them, will be of the greatest service to those who can enter into friendly discussion with Dissenters, or for those Church people whose views on Church principles are but vague.

There undoubtedly is, among earnest religious people, a growing sense of the evils of our present divisions; but before there can be any real movement towards reunion, the various sections of our English Christianity must resolutely set themselves against the unfair and uncharitable efforts to distort the Church's teaching and practice which are so common among the utterances of 'Free Church' leaders. We believe that the cause of reunion will never be furthered by insincere efforts to minimize our differences; the Church stands by great principles which are matters of life or death to her, and which can never be given up at any price, but her position is undoubtedly misunderstood by many earnest Christians, and if we can only lead Nonconformists to examine their own positions, and if we try to explain our own, then there will be real progress made towards home reunion.

In this collection of papers, it need hardly be said, no essential Church principle is given up, and clear light is thrown upon some recent attacks upon the Church from the Nonconformist camp, which is sufficient to cause all religiously minded Dissenters to pause and think. The volume is opportune and likely to prove useful.

*Infallibility.* A Paper read before the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury. By VINCENT McNABB, O.P. With Introduction by SPENCER JONES, M.A., President of the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury. (London: Longmans, 1905.) Price 1s. net.

THIS is a very clever paper. The object of it is to open the way for the acceptance of the Vatican decree of papal infallibility by minimizing the force of the decree and by introducing qualifications in the case of papal infallibility parallel to those which many would allow in the cases of infallibility attached by them to the Church and the Bible. As a sign of a tendency among some Roman Catholics to explain away the work of the Vatican Council, and to do something to remove the additional barrier



to reunion which that Council set up, this paper is not without significance and may even be welcomed. As an exposition of doctrine, it does not allow for the very strong reasons which exist for rejecting papal infallibility in any form. It does not appear to be really in harmony either with the natural inferences from the proceedings of the Vatican Council or with the ordinary statements of Roman Catholic theologians of recognized authority. Unlike Roman Catholic works in general, it is not furnished with any *imprimatur*, though this fact may possibly be due to the peculiar circumstances in which the paper was read and to the method of its publication. Of the introduction from the pen of Mr. Spencer Jones we will only say that it does not lessen the regret we have often felt that one who some years ago did such good work in regard to practical methods of the instruction of children should ever have begun to handle subjects with which he is obviously less fitted to deal.

*The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition, with some Considerations on the Numbering of the Sacraments* (The Church Historical Society's Publications, No. LXXVII.) By F. W. PULLER, M.A., S.S.J.E. (London: S.P.C.K.) Price 5s.

IN view of the method of its publication and the publishers by whom it is issued, it may be well to state that this book is not a short popular account of the subject with which it deals, but a treatise for scholars. It is marked by Father Puller's well-known skill in collecting and arranging materials and in presenting the inferences which may be derived from them. His knowledge of original authorities and his acquaintance with recent literature are worthy of all praise. The main object of the treatise is to shew that the earliest purpose and use of the rite of the Anointing of the Sick were to promote recovery from illness, and that it did not become a Sacrament in the narrower sense of the word for the remission of sins until the eighth or ninth century. As a practical conclusion the learned author thinks it desirable that the usage of Anointing should be authoritatively revived in the Church of England at the present time; but that care should be taken to promote and preserve that view of it which he maintains to have been taught by St. James and held in the early Church.

Father Puller appears to us to have established satisfactorily his main conclusions. On two points of detail we are disposed to criticize his work. In the first place, we do not think isolated references to remission of sins in connexion with this Unction at an early

date so difficult as he regards them. Spiritual benefit would, as a matter of fact, be naturally associated with bodily healing, and the idea of the remission of sins was much less hardened and technical in the early Church than it became at a later time. Consequently, if the phrase 'for good grace and remission of sins' in the Prayers of Serapion, and the word 'sanctify' in the Ethiopic Church Order, are genuine parts of the original text, this fact would be less surprising to us and less contradictory of Father Puller's main thesis than it would appear to him to be. Secondly, we wish that he had developed a little more fully the line of thought expressed in the sentences on p. 63.

'The direct purpose is to restore in a supernatural way physical health. But if the prayers are fervently offered I do not doubt that God will reward the spiritual effort of those who offered the prayers, by an infusion of His grace. And if the prayers are granted, and health is restored, who can doubt that the soul of the sick man will normally be comforted and illuminated, and become aglow with the fire of grateful love?'

We mean that there is much to be said as to the way in which other benefits than the primary and direct purpose of a rite may often be associated with it; and that the connexion between spiritual gifts and bodily healing may be much more subtle and far closer than would at first sight appear. Our Lord's miracles tend to suggest such a view and it receives support both from the history of Christian life and from some phenomena of the present time. However strongly we may maintain that the primary purpose of the Anointing of the Sick is bodily healing, we should hesitate to say anything which might be understood as depreciation of its possible spiritual effects. Here, as so often in theology, the affirmations are safer than the denials.

*The Holy Communion.* By DARWELL STONE, M.A., Pusey Librarian.  
(London: Longmans, Green and Co.) Price 5s.

To readers of the *Church Quarterly Review* this book will have a familiar ring, for it is largely based upon a series of nine articles on the history of Eucharistic doctrine contributed to our pages by Mr. Stone. They will not, therefore, need to be reminded of the carefulness of the work when they meet it here again in an abbreviated form. But one is tempted, at the same time, to regret the form and manner of their reproduction. The ideal book on the Holy Communion in this 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology,' intended for 'that large body of devout laymen, who desire instruction, but

are not attracted by learned treatises which appeal to the theologian,' would not have spent two hundred out of its three hundred pages on a long and technical history of the various phases of Eucharistic doctrine which have prevailed in the Church. This is precisely the learned treatise which does not attract laymen; moreover, in its present form it is not so suitable for the theologian as the original articles were; they were fuller and more satisfying, though even they were in places perhaps not full enough.

Unfortunately, Mr. Stone's last hundred pages do not make up to the bold layman who reaches them for what he has thus far been wanting. The chapter on the Necessity of Communion is little more than an elaborate plea for the communion of infants; and whatever view may be taken of this, it is hardly the point which chiefly needs emphasizing in a book addressed to laymen in these days when communicants are but a tiny percentage of the population. We look in vain for the instruction about the Holy Communion which the layman really wants. He cannot be expected to gather his doctrine out of a wilderness of controversy which even a professed theologian finds bewildering. There is little practical help for him as to his obligations in practice as to communion, or attendance at the service on Sundays and festivals; little help as to the meaning of the English rite, little as to the nature of Eucharistic worship or the practical and fruitful participation in the service, either when communicating or otherwise.

These and many more such necessary things we look for, and do not discover in this volume; necessarily, therefore, we find it somewhat disappointing. But be it understood, this criticism is not so much one of the work of the author as of the editors of the series; and the thing to be desired is that they should arrange for another volume in the series, on the more simple and practical side of the subject, which should give the layman the 'instruction,' in doctrine and practice, that he is said (we hope rightly) to be seeking, and spare him the 'learned treatise' which (we cordially agree) does not attract him.

*The Sacrifice of the Mass: an Historical and Doctrinal Inquiry into the Nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.* By Very Rev. ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D., V.G. (New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company, 1905.) Price 60 cents.

THIS is a careful and painstaking book, shewing some learning, but without many signs of critical or historical or theological insight. The object is to establish the doctrine of the identity of the sacrifice of the Mass with the sacrifice offered on Calvary.

The connexion between the Eucharist and the heavenly sacrifice of our Lord is not altogether ignored, as may be seen by the passages in which it is said that the offering which Christ makes in heaven is sacrificial, and that in the Mass is the sacrifice once offered on the cross and now pleaded in heaven, and by the apparent approval of Father Puller's statement that the Eucharist is a 'sacrifice, the earthly counterpart of the sacrificial oblation which is being carried on in the heavenly tabernacle'; but for the most part the view of sacrifice is narrow and technical, vitiated by the idea that sacrifice necessitates destruction, and without emphasis on the fact which illuminates the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice that the link with Calvary is through the present sacrificial offering of our Lord in heaven.

*The Doctrine of God.* By the Rev. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Instructor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois. Second Edition. Revised throughout. (Milwaukee: The Young Churchman Co.; London: William Walker, 1905.) Price 4s. 6d. net.

IN the second edition this useful little book has been slightly altered in form and carefully revised. It is well suited to supply an outline of study, and for this purpose the abundant references to theological works are valuable. In a very few details Dr. Hall's phraseology might be improved, and we wish that he had shewn himself more mindful of the difference in degree of authority between dogmas actually imposed by the Church as terms of communion and doctrines which, however universally held at some periods, have not received that particular sanction; but, in spite of these defects, his book deserves very hearty commendation for use as an outline and as a guide to further study.

*The Faith of the Church: the Witness of the Three Creeds.* By the Rev. A. R. WHITHAM, M.A., Principal of Culham Training College. (London: Rivingtons, 1905.) Price 2s. 6d. net.

WE have to thank the Principal of Culham Training College for a very clear and useful book on the history and meaning of the Creeds. Originally delivered in substance to the St. Paul's Lecture Society, it supplies exactly what is needed for intelligent readers who have no knowledge of technical theology or the details of Church history. To the excellent treatment of the

three Creeds is prefixed a chapter, no less serviceable, on the witness of the Church and the relation of the Creeds to the Church's life. To criticize two details, Mr. Whitham appears to us to set aside too lightly the possibility that the omission of the word 'holy' in the Creed in the English Communion Office was intentional and due to following an incorrect Latin text, and to overestimate the conclusions which may be inferred from such acceptance of the *Quicumque vult* as is found in the East.

### III.—MORAL PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY, AND APOLOGETICS.

*The Logic of Human Character.* By CHARLES J. WHITBY.  
(Macmillan and Co., 1905.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is an unusual and an interesting book. Its author is a physician, and, as he tells us in his preface (p. v.), 'the correlation of physical structure and psychical function postulated by science is, of course, an assumption underlying the whole of this essay.' 'Moral causes,' he says in his first chapter (pp. 2, 3), 'produce moral effects with the same logical exactitude and precision, and with the same power of permanent modification of the cosmic process as chemical changes display in the chemical sphere. The mathematical tests and measurements which are so successfully applied in the former case are beyond a doubt equally applicable, had we the means or the wit to apply them, in the former also.'

But in the actual course of his discussion he says little or nothing of physical structure; still less does he make any attempt to apply mathematical tests to ethical subjects. He constructs a system of dialectic on the Hegelian model. Each chapter treats of a stage in the development of human character, embracing within itself three triads of subordinate moments. It would take a longer study than the present reviewer has had time to give to assure oneself that these triads and the transitions from each moment to the next are really free from arbitrariness and constitute a necessary system. A doubt sometimes, it must be confessed, obtrudes itself whether somewhat obvious observations have not here and there been given an artificial air of scientific accuracy and profundity by the dialectical form. But however this may be, Dr. Whitby's attempt remains very interesting. In a recent address to biological students Dr. J. S. Haldane has deplored the neglect by experts in natural science of the labours of the great philosophical thinkers. Dr. Whitby is

free from this reproach. He has studied them seriously; those to whom this book shews him specially to have attended are Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer.

The volume before us would be more satisfactory if it did not (as the preface says) assume 'the correlation of physical structure and psychical function postulated by science' without further discussion. No doubt the omission of such a discussion has its advantage; it leaves Dr. Whitby free to deal with the development of character as presented in moral experience without disturbance by the necessity of wrestling with the difficulties involved in all theories of 'the correlation of physical structure and psychical function.' But it leaves the reader much in the dark as to the position really occupied by the author.

Nor, in default of further explanation on this head, are some remarks by Dr. Whitby intelligible at all. Thus it is hard to make anything of the following (on p. 213): 'True virtue must have a sound physiological basis. Its end is not self-denial, but a rounded and complete self-realization'; especially in relation to this (on p. 35): 'The study of character is *primarily* a department of pure ethics, not a branch of anthropological, physiological, or sociological investigation.' What does Dr. Whitby mean by 'pure ethics'? and what is the relation of 'pure ethics,' in his view, to physiology? We find him saying (on p. 94) that 'self-realization can only be attained at the price of self-surrender, the fallacy rebuked being the conception of self as an abstract entity, and not as a function of the universal'; and again (on p. 32): 'To recognize a universal principle and to act upon it and for it without regard to any other consideration; that and that alone constitutes a true volition,' which is thus 'so exceptional' that 'volition, strictly so called, is an ideal rather than a fact of experience.' In these passages there is not only no reference to physiology, but it is difficult to see how physiology could, even if it were introduced, give us any assistance. It is just the universality and idealism of ethical judgements which make the 'correlation' of ethical life with physical structure so difficult a problem, and which led to Kant's sharp contrast between the free noumenal and the necessitated empirical self. A sentence in the preface suggests that Dr. Whitby believes that though 'the study of character as such need not, and indeed must not, await the completion of cerebral physiology,' yet when that science shall have passed beyond its present 'embryonic stage' its results will be available for our guidance in the study of character.



But he gives no hint even of the most general kind as to the manner in which he thinks that this guidance will be afforded. Some of his expressions may indicate that he would seek in the physical structure of the brain not so much the cause of our volitions as their external expression; the body being, as with Schopenhauer, the phenomenon of the will. We know that he does not accept Schopenhauer's antithesis of will and reason, or his doctrine of the immutability of the individual character. But, whatever be the difficulties of the latter doctrine, it is harder without it to hold the view that the body is the phenomenon of the will, corresponding to it throughout. The obscurity as to how the 'moral causes' (in the quotation already given from Dr. Whitby's first chapter) act upon the physical structure or enter into the process of its development is so great as to leave one discontented, in such a book as this, which is philosophical, not physiological, with a mere assumption that they *do*, without any indication of the kind of action or interference which is intended.

The individual human self is, doubtless, not intelligible except as what Dr. Whitby calls a 'function of the universal.' But in its knowledge of itself as such it differs from other parts of the whole; and this is the reason why it is not possible to consider, with Dr. Whitby, that the assertion of human immortality is satisfactorily treated when described as 'no mere dream,' but 'a mythical statement of the conservation of energy, as exemplified in the evolution of humanity.' It may, indeed, be that in the religious experience the individual may rise to such a consciousness of the divine life as the truth and substance of his own that he may find in this consciousness his own possession of life eternal. But Dr. Whitby ignores religion altogether. He may reply, perhaps, that he no more ignores it than he ignores music or politics; the development of character may be carried on in various fields. But it is remarkable that this field of activity is never mentioned where (as, for example, on p. 193, in the chapter on 'Genius') it would be natural to find it; and it would not be difficult to shew that religion is not merely a field of human activity but a moment in the development of human character. Again, in speaking of the conservation of energy, as Dr. Whitby does in the quotation from p. 200, he says more than he should have done without further explanation, though not more than he says by implication in another passage which we have quoted, where he talks of moral causes modifying the cosmic process. The difficulty

is notorious of expressing the relation of consciousness (which is implied in human character) to physical energy; it is from this difficulty that the controversies of psychologists about parallelism, epiphenomenalism, and interaction arise. No doubt Dr. Whitby has considered this problem, and has a view of his own as to what is the best direction in which to look for its solution; but he has concealed this view in the book before us, and has thus given to his discussion an appearance of hanging in the air without visible support.

*Christian Character.* By J. R. ILLINGWORTH. (London: Macmillan and Co.) New and Cheaper Edition. Price 6s.

DR. ILLINGWORTH'S reputation as a philosophical theologian stands so high that a work bearing his name must expect to be received with more exacting criticism than falls to the lot of writers from whom less is expected. It must be admitted that these expectations have sometimes been disappointed. The Bampton Lectures on *Personality, Human and Divine*, confessedly aimed rather at leading up to Dr. Illingworth's conclusions on the profound and difficult subject of which they treated than at stating their conclusions in a definitive form. They displayed a breadth of view and an originality of mind which caused their readers to look forward with lively interest to their promised sequel. But the sequel—the book called *Divine Immanence*—proved on its appearance to be very unworthy of its predecessor. So little criticism did the author appear to have applied to many of his notions and distinctions that it was matter of wonder to some how such easy acquiescence in the security of positions far from impregnable could exist in the same mind alongside with the philosophical insight of which the earlier volume had seemed to give evidence. Somewhat similar defects characterized the later work, *Reason and Revelation*, as was indicated by the writer of a very full and interesting notice of it which was published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. The book now before us is less exposed than any of these to such criticism as we have ventured to suggest, being in the main rather hortatory and practical than speculative in its scope. Nor should we have thought ourselves called upon, in dealing with it, to dwell so much upon what seem to us the defects of its author's philosophical work were it not the case that the books of able apologists for religion like Dr. Illingworth are so apt (through no fault of their own) to be treated as authoritative by those whose faith they defend, and that, therefore, it is more necessary than in the case of authors who have no such following

to call attention to shortcomings, the like of which it would surprise no one dealing with these difficult subjects to find that others discover in his own writings.

Some passages in *Christian Character* it would be hypercritical to censure because the wording of them is not satisfactory from a scientific point of view, since their purpose is not scientific but practical. It would be pedantic to object to the use (on p. 35) without discussion of a saying in the Fourth Gospel about the dispensation of the Spirit as evidence for the actual teaching of Jesus Himself. Dr. Illingworth is right in insisting, in the passage in question, that historical Christianity is from the first known to us as a faith leavening the world rather than as an ascetic or anti-social religion of mere renunciation. Again, for readers who have no call to concern themselves with philosophy, it may be true that the problems of ethics 'are practically solved so soon as we are once convinced that our true life consists in union with an all-holy Person' (p. 113), and that they may legitimately say, 'We still need to consider the details of conduct as they arise, but need no longer discuss its speculative basis': yet this can never be so for the thinker; the problems may be changed by his religious experience, but they are still problems until they are solved.

More seriously misleading are such expressions as the following, on p. 106: 'We cannot say wherein the essential holiness of God consists.' No careful writer would use this phrase as Dr. Illingworth does here, unless he meant to go further, in a direction altogether uncongenial to Dr. Illingworth's thought. Nor does Dr. Illingworth seem to recognize (on p. 179) that, even if the Christian doctrine of the Trinity suggests better than any Unitarian theology can do how an Absolute Personality can be conceived, it does *not* 'enable us to conceive of God as personal, without at the same time derogating from His absolute character,' so long as finite persons are left outside of the absolute life (which thus ceases to be properly absolute); for the profound questions herein involved he does not raise at all. Nor can we find Chapter x. ('Christian Life Supernatural'), though able, anything but very unsatisfactory.

It is, as we said, necessary in the case of a writer enjoying Dr. Illingworth's high reputation as a thinker to point out these defects in an otherwise excellent book, full of beautifully expressed thoughts, such as those on false asceticism (on p. 99), with the delightful description of Fra Angelico's Paradise. Especially good also are Chapter i. ('Life the End of Christian Ethics'), with its appeal to experience; Chapter iii. ('Discipline the Means of Development'); and Chapter viii. ('Sacraments'). We do not remember to have

read anything better on the subject than this last chapter; yet, as often in the writings of High Churchmen on this part of religion, we miss a needed word of blame for the patent and deliberate superstition which mars the service of some who win many of the benefits that come of the right use of sacraments. Chapter vii. ('Prayer') is also good on the whole, and the concluding part of Chapter vi. ('The Cardinal Virtues'), in which art and the stage are discussed, is admirable. Chapter ix. ('Mysticism') is interesting; it is curious, however, that there is no mention made of Jacob Behmen, who would in many ways better satisfy Dr. Illingworth's ideal of mysticism than those mystics to whom he refers. Very well worth consideration are the remark on animal suffering on p. 57, and that on p. 91: 'Pain, in the only region where we can test it, is not incompatible with love.' For it should never be forgotten that the religious attitude towards pain is not one which finds it easy to explain away pain where it does not touch ourselves, but one which, the more fully pain is known from within and in ourselves, can the better divine that it may be good. We shall not, however, find Dr. Illingworth carrying this thought further in the direction indicated by the great hymn, 'O felix culpa,' in which the deepest Christian consciousness has found its classical utterance.

One or two slips may be mentioned. On p. 16, for 'Apocrypha' we must read 'Apocalypse.' On p. 184 it is said that 'the Neo-Platonic formulæ . . . had passed into Christian theology with the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius, and been further familiarized by Scotus Erigena.' But Scotus Erigena was not a familiar writer to the later Middle Ages, otherwise than as the translator of the pseudo-Dionysius. The expression on the same page 'the St. Victors' is odd. One might as well call Keble and Newman 'the Oriels.'

*Ideals of Science and Faith.* Essays by various Authors. Edited by J. E. HAND. (London: George Allen. 1904.) Price 5s. net.

THIS is a book which could only have been produced in an age of journalism. It may be described as, in substance though not in form, a series of interviews. The editor has chosen, it would seem, a number of men whose names are more or less known to the reading public as representative of scientific and religious interests, and persuaded each to write a short account of the way in which he approaches religious problems. Several of the accounts thus collected are not uninteresting; but they are in most cases far too brief to allow the writers to state their position at all adequately, and it is with some irritation

that one feels their limits to be set, not by their own inclination or by the nature of the subject but by the public taste for paragraphs and snippets on the gravest as well as on the most trifling matters. The absurdity of the titles tends to increase the reader's impatience. 'Science' is divided into the various sciences, or quasi-sciences, representatives of which have been induced to contribute. There are physics, biology, psychology, sociology, ethics, and the science of education. 'Faith' is divided into the various 'denominations,' and we have a Presbyterian, a Church of England, and a Church of Rome 'approach,' besides an essay by Father Waggett on 'The Church' (*i.e.* the Church of England) 'as Seen from the Outside,' which is in some ways the best in the book, though one is tempted to ask how long Father Waggett has been outside the Church, and by whose act he was put there. Father Waggett has, we may add, while yielding to the editor's request for a snippet, revenged himself by what is probably a jest at the expense of the whole design, when he gives as an instance of a meaningless question that of a man who should ask: 'What is the Presbyterian view of radium salts?' It is surely scarcely less absurd to ask, except in an historical sense, what is the Presbyterian—or the Anglican—view of the ultimate problems of religion and science, though we are not quite sure how far the representative of Presbyterianism in this volume, Dr. Kelman, would agree with us on this point.

To turn to the several essays. We begin with the 'Physicist's Approach,' and find, without surprise, that the physicist is Sir Oliver Lodge. Rarely does one of the more serious magazines nowadays publish a number without a contribution from the pen of that distinguished man of science; and no one's thoughts on the relations of religion and science are more familiar to the intelligent general reader. Next to him we have Professor Arthur Thomson, of Aberdeen, and Professor Patrick Geddes, of Edinburgh, who contribute a sensible paper on the approach to religious problems which may be made from the side of biology. We could wish, however, that they had shewn themselves less ready to regard knowledge as valuable only for the sake of results other than results in the way of knowledge, although they are careful to explain that they do not mean this of *immediate* results. Professor Muirhead discusses the 'Psychological Approach' in a paper which, while in many ways good, does not seem to reach a very conclusive result.

So far we have been dealing with competent writers on their own subjects, whose observations, if not allowed sufficient space for their proper development, are, whether we agree with them or not, deserving of respect. It is otherwise with the long article—the longest in the collection—called a ‘Sociological Approach,’ and written by Mr. Victor Branford—a tedious and very ill-written essay, with unilluminating diagrams and a concluding advertisement of the Sociological Society. A more pretentious or less valuable piece of work can hardly be imagined than this.

We pass into a very different region when we come to Mr. Bertrand Russell’s ‘Ethical Approach.’ Nowhere else in the book is such insight shewn as in this beautiful and melancholy essay. But it is somewhat out of place among its neighbours. They are all inspired by some kind of a faith in God and in the ultimate unity of power and goodness which belief in God implies; but for the writer of this paper no such hope lights up the prospect. ‘Brief and powerless is man’s life,’ he says on p. 169. ‘On him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for man,’ he cries, ‘it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day.’ He celebrates (p. 165) the triumph of Tragedy building ‘its shining citadel in the very centre of the enemy’s’—that is, of Death’s—‘country, on the very summit of his highest mountain.’ The Christian might use the same words, it may be said, of his religion, which attains the victorious height of tragedy when in the Sufferer God-forsaken of Calvary it finds its God.

Professor Patrick Geddes follows with an ‘Educational Approach.’ This is an odd, fantastic, but interesting essay, well worth thinking over. With this we leave the ‘approaches’ through science and pass to the ‘approaches’ through faith. Dr. Kelman’s ‘Presbyterian Approach’ reaches no important conclusion, but is not without merit. Mr. Ronald Baynes’ ‘Church of England Approach’ is a good and strong piece of writing; while Father Waggett’s ‘The Church as Seen from the Outside’ is very interesting, characterized, as is usual with its author’s work, by humour, by imagination, by freedom of thought, but also, unfortunately, by a certain elusiveness in general effect. Mr. Wilfrid Ward represents, on lines familiar to many of us, an ‘approach’ from the side of Roman Catholicism. He defends conservatism in theology as the proper attitude of a ruling priesthood, and as in no way inconsistent with a



real process of development, which it guards from the mischief of one-sidedness by preserving over against the thesis emphasized by scientific men at any moment an element no less necessary to the ultimate synthesis. The essay is able and ingenious, and even to some extent convincing, though it is a defence which needs careful handling if it is not to be contaminated by sophistry.

It would, perhaps, have been better that this book should not have appeared at all; but, as it has appeared, it is to be admitted that, except for Mr. Branford's essay, it will be found instructive by its readers.

- (1) *Pro Fide*. By CHARLES HARRIS, B.D., Lecturer in Theology, St. David's College, Lampeter. (London: John Murray.) Price 10s. 6d. net.
- (2) *Evidences of Christianity*. By LONSDALE RAGG, M.A., Prebendary and Vice-Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral. (London: Rivingtons.) Price 1s. net.
- (3) *The Truth of Christianity*. By LIEUT.-COLONEL W. H. TURTON, D.S.O. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co.) Price 2s. 6d. net.
- (4) *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. By W. J. CAREY, M.A. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co.) Price 6d. net.

APOLOGISTS for Christianity have never been wanting in any period of the history of the Christian Church. The need for apologetic writing has always been present, and, with greater or less success, has always been met. But never has such need been more pressing than it is to-day, not because the hostile attack is abler, but because doubt is more wide-spread. A questioning spirit is in the air; a cheap press enables the foe of Christianity to reach a larger circle of readers; the growth of secular knowledge has led to a general shifting of old landmarks. There is ample room for apologetics of both the defensive and constructive types.

Of the four books which form the subject of this notice, we should characterize two, those by Mr. Harris and Colonel Turton, as primarily defensive, while the other two are perhaps more constructive in nature. We will take the volumes in what appears to us to be the inverse order of their importance.

Mr. Carey's book, which is prefaced by an Introduction from the pen of Canon Scott Holland, is 'an attempt to show average men what real constructive grounds an average man like them-

selves has for believing in religion.' It is an individual confession of faith, clearly stated in simple language. The author makes no claim to go deeply into his subject. He just states why he believes Christianity to be true, and how his faith has helped him in his own life. There is a personal note about this little volume, which gives it an interest of its own.

Colonel Turton is more ambitious in *The Truth of Christianity*, and writes on natural religion, the Jewish religion, and Christianity. The book has been widely read, for this is the fifth edition. Much that he says is well put, but there is much to cause difficulty to thoughtful minds. The author's attitude towards the higher criticism of the Bible is hardly defensible in the light of present knowledge and scholarship. Colonel Turton attacks the 'late-date theory' of the Pentateuch on the ground that such a theory makes the authors of this legislation 'deliberate impostors.' He refuses to admit the hypothesis of a gradual codification and re-editing of earlier material, because then, he says, you would have a series of impostors instead of one. Was it a desire deliberately to deceive which made the Athenians refer their laws, which had gradually grown up, to Solon, or the Spartans to refer theirs to Lycurgus? Or is the Bible to be exempt from the canons of criticism which one would apply to all other literature and history? Many of the results reached by the higher criticism may be tentative, but its general method and principles are surely valid, and no apologetic which refuses to take them into account can commend itself at the present day. There is, however, not a little in the first and last sections of the volume which is helpful.

Mr. Ragg's volume forms one of the *Oxford Church Text-books*. Into its 150 pages there is compressed an enormous amount of material, with the result that the book is overloaded. But we must perhaps judge a text-book by its main intention, and its purpose is to give a bird's-eye view of a large and comprehensive subject. The arrangement of the subject-matter is good and clear, and there is a short but useful bibliography at the end of the book. Students will undoubtedly find this volume helpful as a general introduction to the subject of Christian evidences.

*Pro Fide*, by Mr. Harris, is a far more important and valuable book than any of the others. Its author writes thus about it in the preface:

'It has, at any rate, the merit of actuality. Many of its most characteristic arguments were originally hammered out in the course

of debates with Secularists in East London, and on the platform of the National Secular Society in Hyde Park. In its present form it represents lectures on practical apologetics delivered during the last five years to ordination candidates at St. David's College, Lampeter.'

We are not sure that Mr. Harris has not attempted to cover too wide a field. There are chapters upon practically every difficulty, philosophical, scientific, Biblical, which is likely to confront a student of religion. But for the most part the level of argument is well sustained. The author has read widely, and has gone very deeply into his problems. His is essentially a philosophic mind, and hence results the special value of the volume. For it is from the side of philosophy, psychology, and science that the most serious attacks are to-day being delivered upon Christianity. The interest has shifted from Dogmatic Theology to the Philosophy of Religion. It is along the lines of an idealistic interpretation of the world which shall do justice to personality that Christian apologetics must for the present move. Most of the chapters have a bibliography attached to them, and there are several interesting appendices. We would mention one in particular, which gives an outline sketch of the history of apologetics from the earliest times.

The lecturer, the teacher, the private student, will find this work of very great value. We hope that Mr. Harris may have time to write more fully upon some of the subjects which he has here hardly done more than touch. If, for example, he would write upon Evolution and the Doctrine of the Fall he would be doing good service. His appendix on that question is hardly satisfactory; nor, as he himself admits, is the opening chapter on 'The Argument for a First Cause.' He is to be warmly congratulated upon having produced so admirable a volume.

#### IV.—CHURCH HISTORY.

*The Church and the Barbarians: being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 461 to A.D. 1003.* By W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of S. John Baptist College, Oxford. (London: Rivingtons. 1906.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

THE third volume of the series entitled 'The Church Universal: Brief Histories of her Continuous Life,' is by the Editor, and covers far more ground than its main title, *The Church and the Barbarians*, would suggest. Mr. Hutton has shewn himself a versatile and prolific writer in many fields, and everything which he writes

is interesting; but it is difficult to determine for what readers the book before us is intended. In the editorial note to the series we are told that 'the greatest freedom as to treatment is allowed to writers in this series. The volumes, for example, will not be of the same length'; but in the Preface to this volume the Editor speaks of the brevity which 'the scheme of the series required,' and adds that much 'is here omitted which would have been included had the book been written on other lines.' But why was it not written on other lines, and why has the Editor imposed upon himself a self-denying ordinance from which the other contributors are exempt? The book attempts to tell the story of five and a-half centuries of the Church's life in seventeen chapters and two appendices, extending in all to only 210 pages, and the result is as irritating to the student as it is bewildering to the general reader. Mr. Hutton would have done well to halve the number of his chapters or to double the length of the volume.

We do not mean to imply that the book is valueless, or that it does not contain many things which are well said, sometimes with vigour and directness, sometimes with gentle irony: *e.g.* 'then the mass of the catechumens was over, and those who were unbaptized or unworthy to remain at that time for the consecration departed from the church, a custom which has survived in England under changed conditions' (p. 189). Here and there are charming little vignettes of some saint or hero, or some historic scene which has appealed to the writer, and we should complain less if attention had really been 'concentrated upon a few central facts and a few important personages.' But there are not a few names and events which a decent regard for the proprieties of history made it impossible to omit, while 'the scheme of the series' made it impossible to say anything about them which should be useful or even, save to the already instructed reader, intelligible. This is especially the case when Mr. Hutton is writing summarily, and necessarily without comment, in the technical language of theology. What, for example, is likely to be the effect upon the mind of the general reader of average intellectual capacity of the following sentence taken at random: 'The original phrase, *theandric energy*, from which the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius started, seems to have been drawn from the unknown Platonist who came to be called Dionysius the Areopagite, and whose writings had a continued influence in the Middle Age. But to all reasonable thinkers the main question was decided.' &c. (p. 89), even with the help

of the scanty additional information vouchsafed on p. 87? There are three references of three or four lines each to the *Filioque*; each contains a piece of information, but the total impression as to its history is inadequate and even misleading. Page 9 suggests, of course unintentionally, that there was no Coptic Church in Egypt before the Council of Chalcedon. On p. 84 we are told that the Monothelite heresy took root in the Lebanon 'under one John Maron [elsewhere he is called Maro], and founded the division, religious and political, of the Maronites, which still endures'; on p. 89, 'only in Syria among the Maronites (followers of John Maro) did Monothelitism linger on for centuries, till they became absorbed in the Latin Church.' Of course the inconsistency is only apparent, but it should have been avoided. The Jacobites and Melkites are mentioned, but quite inadequately, and even their names are unexplained. And what advantage is it to the reader to be told on p. 90 (a reference omitted in the Index) that the *Liber Pontificalis* was the Roman Church history of the time of the Council in Trullo?

Frankly, the book seems to us to have been done hastily, and with less than Mr. Hutton's usual care. The style is capricious and rather slipshod. On p. 49 we are told that Gregory the Great 'set himself determinedly to work against the taint of money which hung over the whole Church.' On p. 36 we find the remarkably awkward sentence: 'True monks were his followers to count themselves only if they lived by the labours of their hands.' On pp. 65-6 four lines are repeated *totidem verbis*. The account which can be gathered as to 'the Church and the Barbarians' in our own island is cut into fragments by the plan of the book. And there are many minor inaccuracies. On p. 8, Felix II. should be Felix III. P. 15, the papacy of Agapetus is given as 534-536, on p. 205 as 535-536; on p. 21 the accession of Pelagius as 'before the end of 557,' on p. 205 as 555; on p. 72 the episcopate of Cæsarius of Arles is given as 501-542, on p. 81 as 501-543; on p. 114 the statement as to St. Patrick's consecration of large numbers of diocesan bishops should be supported. On p. 157, for 'nineteenth' read 'twentieth'; p. 151, read 'Spoletum'; p. 196 (*bis*) read 'Karlings,' as elsewhere. Something must be said, too, about the references to authorities, which are intended for students. On p. 32, '*Anonymus Valesii*,' without reference or edition is not very helpful, nor is '*Var.*, i. 26, ed. Mommsen, p. 28' (*vide* p. 30, where some reference should surely have been made to Dr. Hodgkin's *Cassiodorus*). On p. 47, note 2, the

volume of Migne is omitted (as also on p. 95), and the references to Gregory of Tours need adjustment, and might have been added to the edition of Arndt and Krusch, to which the student is directed on p. 209.

In a work of this kind an Index is indispensable, and that to the present volume is, on the whole, good and useful. On p. 212, s.v. 'Aphthartodocetes,' for 85, read 86; p. 221, s.v. 'Maron, John' (p. 220, 'John, Maro'), the references are imperfect; p. 220, s.v. 'Justiniana Prima,' add 24; p. 217, s.v. 'Facundus,' read 'Hermiane'; on p. 228 Willehad is described as 'archbishop,' on p. 142 as 'bishop.' 'Prester John' (pp. 96-7) should not have been omitted. The 'Short Bibliography,' App. ii., on pp. 209-10 would have been more useful if somewhat fuller information had been given than the bare titles of the books and the surnames of their authors.

*Theodore of Studium: his Life and Times.* By A. GARDNER, Lecturer and Associate of Newnham College, Cambridge. With Illustrations. (London: Edward Arnold, 1905.) Price 10s. 6d. net.

*Saint Théodore, (759-826).* Par L'ABBÉ MARIN, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1906.) Price 2 fr.

THE revival of interest in Byzantine history and literature, and the growth of a juster appreciation of the 'Bas Empire,' has been a marked feature of recent years not only in Germany, but in England, and especially in France. It may be doubted, however, whether the subject will ever become 'popular'; it makes too great a demand upon the knowledge and the patience of the student, while the slender equipment considered sufficient for the writing of so many modern historical romances, with their hackneyed *mise-en-scène* derived from one or other of some four or five periods of English and foreign history, would be hopelessly inadequate for the treatment of episodes in the life of the empire of 'New Rome.'<sup>1</sup> Yet the history is of considerable, and even in some parts of absorbing, interest, of a character very different from the combination of tiresome pedantry, controversial quibbling, and nefarious intrigue in which it used to be summed up; and, in particular, a more general critical study of the

<sup>1</sup> Among recent English novels, *Theophano: an Historical Romance* (John Murray), by Mr. Frederic Harrison, may be mentioned as an attempt which has met with some success, but there is a wide field still unexplored.



history of the Byzantine and Eastern Churches would be productive, we venture to think, of some curious surprises, alike for Western Christians and for the modern representatives of those Churches themselves.

The services to learning of Greek monachism in its palmy days are becoming more and more recognized as hardly inferior to those of the great Benedictine Order in the West. For these we are largely indebted to the great revival of the true monastic spirit, with its combination of devotion and practical activity, which took place under the auspices of Theodore, the famous abbat of Studium, near Constantinople. True he says in a letter to his mother that Theodore among the abbats is as surprising a figure as Saul among the prophets, but his influence was very great. Alike in the Greek and the Roman Calendars, his name finds a place as a staunch upholder of the Catholic faith, and during a life spent in almost ceaseless controversy, and much of it in imprisonment and exile, he found time not only to conduct a voluminous correspondence with all sorts and conditions of men and women, to write hymns, and to compose dogmatic treatises, but also to establish in the communities which he founded in conformity with the revived rule of St. Basil schools for the multiplication of manuscripts by careful and painstaking copyists. The penalties by which he endeavoured to ensure fidelity of execution are curious. The monk who failed to keep his copy and the original perfectly clean, to mark exactly the stops and accents, to observe the lines and spaces, was subjected to a penance of a hundred and thirty prostrations. If he departed from the text of his original the penalty was three days' exclusion from the community; if he read his text badly, fasting on bread and water; while if in a fit of anger he broke his pen, the offence was to be purged by thirty prostrations. The same spirit was maintained in the numerous monasteries which adopted the Studite rule.

The two biographies of Theodore which lie before us are both of considerable interest, and the English one is enriched by a number of photographs by Dr. Edwin Freshfield and a beautiful facsimile of a page of a Studite Psalter in the British Museum. Their aim is somewhat different. Miss Gardner's work is a study of the period, and hence she includes in her survey not only the outlines of Byzantine history from Constantine Copronymus, who disliked monks as much as images, to Michael the Stammerer and Theophilus, with a sketch of Theodore's life, the part which he played in opposition to the

divorce and remarriage of Constantine VI. and in the revived Iconoclastic controversy, his relations with the Papacy, his varied activities, monastic, literary and controversial, his influence in his lifetime and later, but also a study of Western affairs, so far as they can in any way be brought into connexion with the subject. Miss Gardner is too good an historian to state hypotheses as facts, but we confess that she seems to us to overestimate Theodore's influence in the relations of East and West as much as she underrates the importance of some of the interests which he had most at heart. The result is that while doctrinal and ecclesiastical subjects are not shirked, the discussion of them (notably in the case of the Iconoclastic controversy) is marked by a certain superficiality and absence of sympathy, which makes it doubtful in some cases whether the real issues are clearly understood. We are reminded, while we read, of Justin Martyr's statement, that 'no one believed Socrates to the extent of dying for what he taught,' and are left wondering why, if this be all, Theodore and his followers preferred the rigours of exile to compromise and peace. The book is stronger on the historical side, and the account of the authorities and study of Theodore's literary labours are useful and interesting; but we could have wished for a greater freedom of quotation, which a judicious pruning in the parts of the book which are only remotely connected with the subject would have rendered possible.

It must be added, with regret, that it is long since we have read a modern work of erudition of which the proofs have been so badly corrected. There are mistakes in the printing of Greek on pages 15, 67 (two), 70, 114 (three), 142, 171, 173, 189, 196, besides monstrosities such as *ἐντὸς* (p. 114). The titles of important books appear in inaccurate forms; e.g. '*Novem* [sic] *Patrum Bibliotheca*' (p. 82), '*Monumenta Germaniae Historiarum*' (sic) (p. 97), '*Theodore von Studium*' for Dr. G. Schneider's interesting work *Der hl. Theodor von Studion*, and '*L'Abbée* [sic] *de Rossano*' for Mgr. Batiffol's well-known book. On p. 81, for 'deadly' read 'capital'; p. 133, for 'Jaffe' read 'Jaffé'; p. 151, 'patristic saws,' surely 'views'; p. 157, read 'expression'; *ibid.* 'pseudo-Dionysius Areopagitica' should not have been overlooked; p. 172, 'the Opscian theme,' read 'Opsician,' and for 'Boneta' probably 'Bonita'; p. 200, for 'Acrita' read 'Acritas,' as on p. 219; p. 210, read 'orphanotrophus.' The conjecture (*ibid.*) that in speaking of children as *χριστοφόροι* Theodore may be 'thinking of boys carrying the icons of Christ in a procession' is ingenious but surely unnecessary. For its use of

martyrs *cf.* Eus. *H.E.* viii. 10. On p. 172, 'Nicetas, surnamed Alexius,' is inaccurate, and the spelling of the name of the adherents of Islam on pp. 143, 150, 156, should be uniform. Some explanation is required of the uses of 'Chalce' on pp. 8, 18, 103, 254. The curious variations, 'Island of Princeps' (pp. 104, 221, 267), 'Prince's Island' (pp. 123, *cf.* 196), 'The Islands' (p. 127, *cf.* 123), 'Princes' Island' (pp. 194, 196, *cf.* 'Island of Princes,' Index, *s.v.*), together with the mention of the 'Island of Protas, also a stronghold of the orthodox' (p. 196), suggest an imperfect acquaintance with the little group of islands, home of so many State and Imperial prisoners, to whose strange and melancholy history M. Schlumberger has devoted a monograph. On p. 183 it is not strictly accurate to speak of the representation of the five Patriarchs as 'necessary to a lawful Council,' nor should 'Porphyrogenetus' (p. 286) be used as a proper name. A number of infelicities of style and a curious looseness in the use of metaphor (*e.g.* p. 63, 'the inertia which hung about him like a fate') would have been removed, no doubt, by a more thorough revision.

The Abbé Marin's work is one of the collection 'Les Saints,' edited by M. Henri Joly, a series which has attained remarkable popularity in France, several of the volumes having reached their tenth edition.<sup>1</sup> The book before us is by a writer who has already won a reputation by his theses on Studium and the monks of Constantinople,<sup>2</sup> and though its scope is necessarily more restricted than that of Miss Gardner's work, being devoted entirely to a study of Theodore's achievements and character, its usefulness is by no means confined, like that of some others of the series, to the sphere of edification. Dr. Marin writes for the student as well as for the general reader, but he wears his learning lightly, and his style has an ease and charm which will be delightful to both.

If from Miss Gardner's pages Theodore emerges in the somewhat unsuspected guise of a Puritan (pp. 222-3), it is from the other side of his character—as Theodore the Catholic—that the great Abbat appeals to Dr. Marin. The account which is given of his aims and struggles, his relations with his monks and his numerous correspondents, is written with sympathy and insight;

<sup>1</sup> Some volumes of the series have already been reviewed in our pages in the article on 'Christian Sanctity' (*Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1904).

<sup>2</sup> *De Studio coenobio Constantinopolitano* and *Les moines de Constantinople jusqu'à la mort de Photius* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1897).

and the treatment of the external history is adequate, while the limitation of his scope enables the author to supply a somewhat fuller narrative of incidents in the life of the Saint than is to be found in the larger work. Dr. Marin emphasizes, as is natural, the language of extraordinary devotion and respect in which Theodore appeals to the See of Peter for support against the Iconoclasts, though he exaggerates a little, perhaps (as Theodore undoubtedly did), the value of the support which the Popes of the time were either able or prepared to give. The extracts from Theodore's works are fairly numerous for the size of the book, and the translations are careful and scholarly. We have noticed very few misprints. On p. 58 read 'attention,' p. 84 read '808,' p. 96 read 'curopalate.' We do not agree with all Dr. Marin's inferences from the authorities, but on the whole his account of Theodore is a well-defined, fair-minded and convincing one, even though he may seem sometimes a little inclined (to use his own quotation from Gregory Nazianzen<sup>1</sup>) 'on the same plant to avoid the thorns and to pluck the roses.'

*Lives of the English Martyrs.* Edited by DOM BEDE CAMM. Two Volumes. (London: Burns and Oates.) Price 7s. 6d. each net.

THIS is the first instalment of a collection of sixty-three biographies of Churchmen who suffered death under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and who were beatified by Pope Leo XIII. in 1886. The work consists of two volumes, of which the first deals with the reign of Henry VIII., and includes the Lives of Bishop Fisher, Sir Thomas More, together with those of John Forest, Adrian Fortescue and other exemplary Religious who suffered during the shameful spoliation of the monasteries. The several sketches were commenced by different Fathers of the Oratory, and in many cases left in various stages of incompleteness, rewritten and completed by others, and they naturally suffer in the process. The subjects' special interest from the writer's Roman standpoint consists in their rejection of the Royal Supremacy, since it is assumed that the cause of their death was their advocacy of Papal claims against royal aggression.

The modern process of Canonization is briefly sketched in the Introduction. Before Canonization comes Beatification, which, we are told, is preceded by a long and stringent scrutiny of the writings, virtue and miracles of the person proposed for that honour. A favourable verdict is followed by a decree of Beatification, which permits of a local cultus or veneration through a diocese, a religious

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Naz. *Carm.* II. ii. 8, 60-1, an interesting passage.

order, or a country. It is, however, only Canonization which elevates the Beatified to universal recognition on the altars of Roman Christendom. But before advancing to Canonization it must be proved that the Beatified has wrought two miracles more since the decree of his Beatification. If this be proved to the satisfaction of the appropriate authorities, it is then ordered that his memory shall be celebrated universally on a given day. Thus Beatification permits a certain cultus, while Canonization renders it compulsory. But the writer warns us against supposing that this elaborate (and costly) process was enacted in the case of the sixty-three Beatified English people described in the present pages. Every rule has its exceptions, and this is a case in point. The process was dispensed with in the case of the sixty-three. On the authority of a book of engravings taken from frescoes in the church of the English College in Rome, the Congregation of Rites was induced to decide in 1886, by an expeditious method, that these English 'martyrs' were worthy of this honour. For—so ran the argument—the representation of such persons on the walls of a church together with canonized saints was equivalent to the grant of ecclesiastical cultus. The joy caused among English Catholics by this decree was, we are told, deep and sincere; qualified, however, by the uncertainty that it by no means assures the permanent honour of the persons upon whom it is conferred. For when they come up for Canonization not only may that be refused, but the previous verdict may be reversed. And it appears that this caution is anything but superfluous. For since the decree of Beatification was issued at Rome in 1886, an 'unfortunate paper' (p. 409) has been discovered, in which one of those Beatified explicitly accepts the Royal Supremacy—the very principle which he was beatified for denying. This 'difficulty,' says the writer, will have to be met before any further steps are taken to secure his Canonization. Meanwhile, 'more positive evidence that he denied the Royal Supremacy is much to be desired' (p. 411).

Roman theologians generally concur in teaching that Canonization of the saints comes within the province of the Church's infallibility, although they are divided on the question whether this statement is or is not of faith. But they would, it appears, agree with Benedict XIV., that he who dares to assert that the Pope has erred in any particular instance of Canonization is, 'if not heretical, at least rash; bringing scandal on the whole Church; injurious to the saints; preaching the opinions of heretics who deny the Church's authority in Canonization; moreover approximating to heresy, because encouraging the ridicule of infidels; erroneous, and rendering its author liable to severe penalties.'

This applies of course only to Canonization, not to Beatification. Hurter, indeed, in his well-known *Compendium of Dogmatic Theology*, says that it is possible to maintain that the Church is also infallible in Beatification of the servants of God. He adds that many weighty writers have maintained this, although it cannot be affirmed as a certainty. Hurter himself decides against it on the ground that the ultimate sentence of the Church is Canonization and not Beatification, the one being assertive, the other permissive ; moreover, Beatification has not been regarded as infallible even by the Pontiffs themselves. There is, however, a moral certainty about it that the Pope acts with prudence and wisdom. Such appears to be the doctrine as taught to Seminarists.

It would be interesting to know what effect the Beatification of these Henrician sufferers, coupled with the uncertainty whether they all deserve and will all eventually retain their position or not will have on thoughtful devotion in the Roman community in England. Permission to accord reverence to and to commemorate for a time persons against whom historical evidence of a disastrous character has been discovered, and who may be therefore some day deprived of their present elevation, would appear a spiritual privilege of questionable advantage. Certainly the possible ultimate reduction to an ordinary level of one who has for a season enjoyed the regard due to exceptional holiness is a reversal so embarrassing to contemplate, involving so serious a temporary misdirection of reverence, that to some minds it would appear more prudent to forego the permission to bestow it until such time as the insecurity may be finally removed. Dom Bede Camm feels bound to warn his brethren of the insecurities of Beatification. It remains to be seen how they will regard it.

The second volume of this work is published as one of the well-known Quarterly series. It thus, however, has the unfortunate effect of appearing to have no connexion with volume one, which is quite differently bound. The contents of the second volume could hardly be expected to equal in interest those of the former, since the narratives are connected with obscurer men. There is however the exception of Edmund Campion, whose biography occupies almost a hundred pages. The tone and style may be illustrated from the description of Campion as a bluecoat boy making an oration at Queen Mary's entry into London. 'Well assured did his youthful predictions seem that day, of the reign of justice, mercy and religion with which England has now to be blessed' (p. 267). This is apparently written without conscious irony. Assertions of that kind may serve their purpose in a partisan pamphlet ; they can have no pretensions whatever to be regarded as history.



*English Church History, 1509-1575.* By REV. A. PLUMMER, D.D.,  
Master of University College, Durham. (Edinburgh :  
T. and T. Clark.) Price 3s.

THIS second set of four lectures, published by Dr. Plummer, completes his survey of the Reformation period ; the latter part of the period, 1575-1649, had already been treated in his earlier volume. The lectures were worth publishing as a convenient and sensible summary of the history. They do not add anything of importance to what is already known from larger and more authoritative sources to students of the period, but they will be found valuable by Church people who desire a sound popular account of the English Reformation. Judged from this standpoint they well deserve to be recommended, though, if viewed from a more critical and scientific standpoint, they would call for some complaint on the score both of inaccuracy in details and of want of evenness and proportion in general treatment. It will be a great pity if they keep Church people from reading Dr. Dixon's masterly volumes or Mr. Gairdner's shorter treatment of the bulk of the period ; but these lectures, as they were illuminating and acceptable to their original audience in the Exeter Diocesan Church Reading Society may, with great advantage, find a similar public elsewhere in their printed form.

*Tables illustrating the Transmission of the Episcopate in English and American Lines.* By LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D. With introductory note by the Rev. Prof. THOMAS RICHEY, D.D. (New York : Edwin S. Gorham.)

THIS is a kind of supplement for the American Church of the invaluable *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* by Bishop Stubbs. By the use of that book and of additional materials Dr. Waterman has prepared a series of tables relating to the succession of the American Episcopate from English, Scottish, and Irish Bishops. There can be no doubt that these tables will be of great service to American Churchmen and to other students of the American Church, and the industry of the compiler deserves high commendation. In some respects we have found his methods confusing. In particular, Table I, giving the shortest line of succession from Archbishop Stigand to Bishop Olmsted the Coadjutor Bishop of Central New York, by tracing in some cases through the co-consecrators, would have been more satisfactory as a supplement to a table giving the succession through the principal consecrators. Still, with a little trouble the information which a reader is likely to require can readily be found.

## V.—SERMONS.

*Some Aspects of Christian Truth.* Sermons preached by EDWARD STUART TALBOT, D.D., Bishop of Rochester [now of Southwark]. With an Introductory Essay. (London: Rivingtons, 1905.) Price 6s. net.

THE sermons here published represent the whole of Dr. Talbot's tenure of the See of Rochester, and, though preached on very various occasions and to audiences differing as widely as at a military parade and a university, there is scarcely one of them but undercuts the ordinary levels of thought in the manner we are accustomed to associate with the Bishop of Southwark. But the most important part of this volume is, if we mistake not, the Introduction. These twenty-six pages are a very distinct contribution to the religious philosophy of the time, and add to the natural, though not altogether reasonable, regret that the manifold activities of their author should have confined his published thought to a few sermons and essays. The tendency of modern thought is to endeavour to find a middle course between the acceptance of traditional creeds and the refusal to recognize in Christ anything further than the highest type of moral excellence. The Bishop instances Sabatier, but it is equally true of Harnack, Wernle, and others. The testimony of witnesses like these is to be hailed with gratitude, and is the more valuable by reason of its independence. But it is inadequate. The method followed in dealing with the facts of 'revelation' must be genuinely inductive. These, like all other facts, can only be rightly apprehended by means of a principle of interpretation. The spiritual man sees the revelation in the facts, which are unrelated, and therefore unintelligible, save on the hypothesis of the Incarnation. Their 'naturalness' lies in the proportion between the Incarnation and the rest of human life.

*The Old Testament and its Messages.* By E. C. S. GIBSON, D.D., Vicar of Leeds [now Bishop of Gloucester]. Third Edition. 1906. (London: Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d.

THIS is a very useful and timely book. Dr. Gibson has done wisely to correct the impression that preachers nowadays avoid choosing subjects from the Old Testament. He has also given us an excellent example of what such preaching should be. The sermons have not, indeed, the depth of thought and beauty of style which mark

Mr. Stopford Brooke's *The Old Testament and Modern Life*, but they have the attractiveness which comes from clearness and vigour, from candour in stating difficulties and transparent honesty in meeting them. Incidentally Dr. Gibson deals with most of the topics which cause perplexity to modern readers of the Bible. The moral difficulties of the Old Testament are well handled in the sermons on the book of Judges and on Job; there are some discerning remarks on the Old Testament miracles in Sermons VI. and VII.; the language of the imprecatory Psalms is considered in Sermon XVII.; while throughout the book the positive moral teaching of the Old Testament and its bearing on present-day problems are effectively brought out. Good examples of this will be found in the sermons on Confession, on Betting and Gambling, and on the text, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes.' It should be added that there are two instructive sermons on the use and value of the Apocryphal books.

In two papers which conclude the volume Dr. Gibson sums up the present position of the English Church in relation to the results of Biblical criticism. He states very clearly the real point in dispute between Christian criticism and that which may be called 'naturalistic':

'You may either,' he says, '(1) deny God's interposition throughout—banish Him from the Old Testament as from the history of to-day, as the rationalist does; or, (2) you may accept the view of history which the Hebrew prophets were always struggling to set before their people. You may see in all things, *now as then*, the hand of Him without whom not a sparrow falleth to the ground.'

In other words, the evolutionary view, whether of nature or of the Old Testament religion, implies for a Christian a heightened sense of the Divine immanence.

Dr. Gibson might, with advantage to his general line of treatment, have given a more prominent place to the teaching of the prophets. Perhaps he does not indicate with sufficient clearness the extent to which the Old Testament, both in its historical and legal portions, reflects and depends upon the spirit of prophecy. We miss, too, some restatement of the progressive Messianic teaching of Scripture. Perhaps Dr. Gibson will be able to supply this defect in another volume. Meanwhile, we are grateful to him for a really serviceable book. Doubtless his attention will have been already drawn to a few misprints and to one or two questionable statements of fact in the first edition.

*On Holy Scripture and Criticism: Addresses and Sermons; and On the Church of England: Sermons and Addresses.* By H. E. RYLE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester. (London: Macmillan and Co.) Price 4s. 6d. and 6s.

THE first of these volumes contains a temperate and weighty *apologia* for the higher criticism. The addresses were for the most part delivered to popular audiences, and set forth in guarded language the principles by which the modern investigation of Scripture, and especially of the Old Testament, is guided. A paper on the teaching and preaching of the Old Testament, read at the Church Congress of 1903, perhaps gathers up in comprehensive form the main points on which the Bishop desires to lay stress. Another noteworthy address is the sermon on 'Physical Science and the First Chapter of Genesis,' preached on the occasion of the visit of the British Association to Liverpool.

What strikes the reader is the preacher's strong hopefulness and common-sense. He discounts beforehand, so to speak, 'the almost proverbial unpopularity' of critical studies in the Church. 'Their unpopularity,' he says, 'is not a matter which should surprise us, however disappointing it may be to find Christian scholarship mistaken for the veiled ingenuity of foes.'

'It is a mistake,' he says elsewhere, 'to bewilder the minds of an audience, which rarely includes many special students, with problems in which no vital interest is taken, and for the consideration of which little or no previous training can be assumed. The preacher of the Old Testament, therefore, is occupied with spiritual, doctrinal, moral and practical questions, not with the results of research. For him, as a pastor and spiritual guide, the Old Testament contains the Holy Scriptures as they were used for the same purpose by our Lord and His Apostles.'

Dr. Ryle's strength as a teacher lies in this spirit of consideration for the average intellectual level of his hearers. 'We should bear in mind,' he tells us, 'the common want of acquaintance with the Hebrew language, the prevalent ignorance as to the formation of the Hebrew canon, and the lack of imaginative sympathy on the part of modern Christian thought towards the ancient literature of a Semitic race.'

The Bishop's remarks on the impossibility, under existing conditions, of reunion with the Roman Church are very plain and forcible. As he points out, it is impossible that the English Church should withdraw from the position she has taken up in regard to Scripture—indeed, the abandonment of it would be an act of treason to the Reformation. And, on the other hand, there is no prospect whatever

that Rome will renounce the error of placing unwritten tradition upon a level with Scripture as a standard of doctrine. It is well that this fundamental obstacle to reunion should be pointed out by one who speaks with the unquestionable authority of a scholar. The Bishop's book may be warmly commended to clergy and laity as a strong and reassuring but temperate summary of the relation of the English Church to the Bible and Biblical criticism.

In the volume of Addresses on the Church of England there is a good deal which is of value. As compared with Bishop Creighton's book, *The Church and the Nation*, it shews less of historical grasp and has less brilliancy of style; but it is, nevertheless, the kind of book which does good by clearing the air and facing difficulties with courage and common-sense. It contains clear statements of principle; for instance, the principle of national independence: 'Things in themselves of subordinate importance are to be decided by the Church of the people, in accordance with the needs of the time and with the character of the race, for the spiritual advantage of worshippers.' We have a comprehensive survey of history in the address on 'The Protestantism of the Church of England,' and a candid and useful discussion of particular points in other addresses; e.g. the use of incense, the invocation of saints, and the adoration of the Virgin. There is also some plain teaching in regard to the ordinances of the Church; for example, the imposition of hands in ordination, the use of confession, and the practice of fasting Communion.

On the whole, the Bishop's view of the Church of England is markedly optimistic. He seems to see in the prevailing tone and temper of the Church what he wishes to see, and he is never weary of insisting on the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism. At the same time he does not shut his eyes to the fact that comprehensiveness implies divergence.

'There are different currents of character and feeling in the English race which never wholly blend, never completely amalgamate. There are different shades of opinion and view which no amount of learning, or study, or argument will ever hope to assimilate. The Church and the State are alike in this respect. Their riches and their poverty, their strength and their weakness, are the same. Differences, cleavages of thought, are bound to show themselves wherever there is freedom of opinion and liberty of expression. It is folly to ignore them, and greater folly to attempt to remove them. . . . The divisions on the surface will show themselves whenever the growth is healthy. And the differences that show themselves within any great corporate body need be no source of weakness.'

Dr. Ryle gives us the impression of being concerned with an

ideal of what the Church might be rather than with actual difficulties and anomalies. He reminds us himself that he writes as a 'young Bishop,' and there is, perhaps, something academic in his view of the Church which larger experience of episcopal work will correct. We observe that he barely touches on questions of Church reform. Indeed, there is only one practical topic, to which he repeatedly refers, namely, the need of altering the present use of the Athanasian Creed. On this matter the Bishop speaks very decidedly and with evident feeling. He says, with justice, that a clergyman 'cannot loyally dissociate himself from the feeling of the laity to whom and for whom he ministers,' and he believes that among the laity there is a widespread though inarticulate feeling of dissatisfaction at the present mode of reciting the Creed. Dr. Ryle himself holds that the remedy lies in the *disuse* of the Creed in the public service of the Church. Such disuse 'would not constitute any departure from primitive custom. It would remove a cause of soreness and division; it would substitute simplicity for abstruseness; it would promote unity and joy of worship.'

In the stirring sermon preached after Archbishop Temple's death the Bishop speaks with anxiety of the burden of responsibility which has now descended upon a generation 'intent on amusement and pleasure.' He evidently has a profound sense of the greatness of the opportunities which lie before the Church. Indeed, the sermons contained in this volume are impressive chiefly because they embody not so much the experience as the hopes and aims of one whose position will give him in the near future a power of initiative and leadership which will, we may well hope, be wisely and worthily used.

*The Faith of Church and Nation.* By the Right Rev. ARTHUR F. WINNINGTON INGRAM, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 1904.) Price 3s.6d.  
*The Gospel in Action.* By the same. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 1906.) Price 3s. 6d.

It would of course be easy to criticize these volumes. We may look, for example, at the sermons delivered on great national or historic occasions and feel a shade of disappointment at a certain lack of high distinction in thought or language which the moment seemed to demand. Or we might construct the sort of answer which a sceptic might give to the defence of Christian truth, which many of the addresses contain, considered merely in the light of intellectual apologetic. Here, however, we should have to reckon with the undoubted fact that thinking men,



starting from no prejudice in favour of the Bishop's ecclesiastical standpoint, have borne testimony to his singular power. Then again the cheery optimism which fascinates the young and adventurous, may fail to satisfy those whose ears yearn for the deeper note of the prophetic spirit. The reader is apt to be wearied with the reappearance of the same illustration from literature or experience, and the obvious dependence of the preacher on the ideas and phrases of others rather than on first-hand acquaintance with the sources of theological or philosophic thought. But it would be a shallow criticism to say that the teaching of the Bishop of London did not rest upon a solid basis of original thinking, though of the concrete rather than of the abstract kind. It is this, perhaps, more than any other mental qualification which brings him into close touch with those whom for the most part he is called upon to influence. But the real justification for publishing what the author would be the last to claim as permanent additions to the literature of the country, is the insight they afford into the daily work and influence of one who is himself among the highest examples of the Gospel in action that England can at present shew, and whose simple and straightforward preaching of Christ crucified to all classes alike, in the spirit of a servant of servants, has already won for him a distinguished place among the occupants of his own illustrious see.

*College and Ordination Addresses.* By (the late) FORBES ROBINSON.  
(London : Longmans, 1905.) Price 3s. 6d. net.

THIS volume consists of twenty-seven short addresses. The large majority were preached to congregations of young men, either in college chapels, or, in the case of three of them, in the quiet day before the Southwell ordination; five were addressed to town or country congregations, and one was preached at the Southwell ordination of Advent 1898. The interest of the volume will for many lie very largely in these circumstances. A singularly fresh, sincere and profound mind is here seen in the act of putting some of the principal truths of religion before the 'average undergraduate.'

The subjects most frequently treated are prayer, the conditions of man's life as illustrated by the first few chapters of the Bible, the character of our Lord, and some ethical ideals and questions of practice. The treatment is amazingly frank and simple. The preacher never hesitates to take his audience into his intimate

VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

Q

confidence. He lays his own heart bare in his determination to penetrate to their hearts. Not that there is any excess of emotion. The style and thought are severe in their simplicity; but it is the severity of intimate talk, where there is no place for rhetoric or exaggeration, and the simplicity imposed by an intense regard for truth and a profound appreciation of the difficulties besetting its exposition. In fact, one of the most marked characteristics of these addresses is the directness with which the preacher gets into contact with the individual in his audience; and this characteristic is obviously the outcome of an intensity of affection, which, with little direct expression, burns in every page.

Perhaps the most striking of these addresses are those which deal with prayer. The frank insistence on the personal experience of the preacher, the unshrinking assertion of the philosophical and practical difficulties, the treatment of analogies from ordinary life, and the basing of the whole upon the personal relation to the Divine Father, make a singularly persuasive and appealing argument. The two addresses on scenes from the Gospel of St. Mark are models of exposition and instruction. But in all there is the same note of simple and profound individuality, the same impression of character as beautiful as it is difficult to analyze. Not the least interesting part of the book is the preface. It gives a striking picture of Forbes Robinson in his rooms in college, in his friendships, and in his personal religion. To all who remember him this little volume will be full of pathos; but to them and to many others it will also bring a fresh stimulus to reality and a new courage for plain speech.

*Bread and Salt from the Word of God.* In Sixteen Sermons. By THEODOR ZAHN, Theol.D., Hon. Litt.D. Cambridge, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated by C. S. BURN and A. E. BURN, D.D., Rector of Handsworth and Prebendary of Lichfield. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1905.) Price 4s. 6d. net.

THE plentiful translation of the theological writings of the religious teachers of Protestant Germany has so widely familiarized the English mind with their abstract and scientific thought, that the rendering into our own tongue of the direct and practical application of these studies in the Christian pulpit has become a task of considerable importance. The work of the

present translators is therefore one for which we may be grateful. But we must confess to some disappointment both with the material and the method of Dr. Zahn's discourses. No doubt a sermon, like a photograph, can never be wholly satisfactory to those who are unacquainted with the personality of the man. To this must be added the imperfect sympathy between readers of one and a preacher of another nationality. There are also difficulties of translation that can never be wholly overcome. But when every deduction has been made, it remains that the attractiveness of the general title and the terseness of the headings prefixed to many of the sermons create an expectation which is scarcely fulfilled. They do not live, nor provoke the exclamation, 'Let us go and fight Philip,' nor even leave a very distinct impression of what it is that the preacher would have us remember. They are a trifle platitudinous, one of the worst faults being an underlying lack of humour. 'One gave his ass; who knows if he ever got it back again?' is a curious comment on the events of Palm Sunday.

#### VI.—LITURGOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

*The Ceremonies of the Mass arranged conformably to the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.* The Ceremonies of Low Mass, by the Rev. WILLIAM MCGARVEY, D.D., Rector of St. Elizabeth's Church, Philadelphia, author of *Liturgiae Americanae*; The Ceremonies of High Mass, by the Rev. CHARLES P. A. BURNETT, B.D., Curate of St. Ignatius's Church, New York. (New York and London: Longmans, 1905.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

SOME features in this book by Dr. McGarvey and Mr. Burnett are a little perplexing to a reviewer. The greatest stress is laid on the obligation of obedience to the Book of Common Prayer and on the merits of the American Prayer Book. 'In preparing this book,' it is said, 'the meaning of every rubric of the Communion Office was carefully sought for, and has been scrupulously adhered to'; 'the obligation to observe the rubrics of the Prayer Book is imposed . . . by a written promise and by a solemn vow'; 'the writer cannot but deprecate that superficial spirit which dismisses the consideration of every peculiarity of the Prayer Book with a sneer, and does not hesitate to disregard its plainest directions'; 'it is our bounden duty loyally to conform to what the Church has prescribed for our observance.' The American Prayer Book is said to be superior to the Roman Missal because it does not contain the 'inexplicable

passages found in the Latin Canon which are so hard to reconcile with the doctrine of the Real Presence,' the 'statements so contrary on the face of them to the Tridentine definition,' 'so that there is not one word in our American Prayer of Consecration which is remotely inconsistent with the doctrine of the Real Presence, even as that doctrine is defined by the Council of Trent.' It is superior, again, to the English and Scottish Offices because each of them is distinguished from the American as being 'lacking in some one sacrificial feature.' Consequently, the American Prayer Book is represented by the writers of the volume before us as containing the best of existing liturgies, and, as the result of the work of Divine providence, 'fitting the American Church for the part she is to take in the work of restoring again the visible unity of the Holy Church throughout all the world.'

The perplexing point to which we have referred is that writers who take this view of the American Prayer Book should think it necessary to surround the use of it with the most minute and most complete details of the existing Roman ceremonial, and to assume the ordinary conditions of Roman Catholic practice. One instance, parallel to hundreds of other directions, taken from the instructions for the priest's approach to the altar, will illustrate what we mean :

'If he passes by the high altar he bows profoundly, with head covered ; if the Sacrament be in the tabernacle, he genuflects on the right knee with head covered. He takes no notice of other altars if the Sacrament be not reserved thereon. He genuflects on both knees and uncovers his head whenever, on going to or from the altar, he passes by where the Sacrament is exposed, or is being elevated, or administered to the faithful, or is being carried near him through the church.'

We can understand a writer who thinks the Prayer Book a poor piece of work, unsatisfactory in all respects, except that in it have been providentially retained the bare essentials of Catholic life, wishing for the elaborate supplementing on the most extensive scale which Dr. McGarvey and Mr. Burnett direct. What is puzzling is that their volume should be the work of men who take so extremely high a view of the merits of the American Book of Common Prayer. There are, we believe, very many English and American clergy, whose judgement on the prayers in the Latin canon, *Supra quae, Supplices te rogamus, and Per quem,* would be far less condemnatory than that in this book, who would not share the desire of its authors for the use in the Anglican

churches of the whole ceremonial and methods of the Church of Rome. This desire is, perhaps, not unconnected with an apparent determination to make everything fit in with the Tridentine doctrine of the Eucharist and the usual Western view of the Consecration, which, in our opinion, gives a twist which may be discerned in more passages than one.

It is important that English readers should remember that Dr. McGarvey and Mr. Burnett refer to the American Prayer Book. For instance, the advice to omit the Commandments and the direction to omit the Creed on certain occasions, whatever other reasons may underlie them, are in connexion with the American rubrics: 'The Decalogue may be omitted, provided it be said once on each Sunday'; 'the Creed may be omitted if it hath been said immediately before in Morning Prayer.'

It is quite right that English and American priests should know the usages of the Roman rite and ceremonial, so that they may consider these in determining how to do the things which must be done somehow, the methods of more elaborate ceremonial for the churches and occasions for which it is suitable, and the source of many private devotions. For such a purpose this book may have utility for those who cannot easily read ecclesiastical Latin. For the purpose for which it is apparently intended, of being a manual to be taken as a guide and closely followed, we cannot commend it. Such a use of it would be an act not of the freedom which the English and American Churches allow in many matters of ceremonial but of bondage to a very narrow system, on lines not easy to justify. We do not agree with the contention that every gesture in an English church to-day must be identical with those in the English churches of the year 1548. This competing theory, that we are to be bound hand and foot to the ceremonial directions of the Roman Missal and its commentators, though it may be less insular, is no more satisfying than its rival.

*The Vedast Missal, or Missale Parvum Vedastinum, a Thirteenth century MS., probably Flemish, but containing the germ of the subsequent English Uses.* Edited, with Notes and Facsimile, by ZOUCH H. TURTON. (Printed for the author at Great Yarmouth. London: Thomas Baker.)

THE manuscript to which Mr. Turton has given the name of 'the Vedast Missal' is a small volume in his own possession. The early part of its present contents, in a hand of the thirteenth century,

includes the Canon and the latter part of the Ordinary of the Mass, together with a selection of Masses, for the most part votive or taken from the *Commune Sanctorum*. Masses from either part of the *proprium* are provided only for a few festivals—Christmas, Easter, the feasts of St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. Luke, and the feast, the octave, and the Sunday in the octave, of St. Vedast. Whitsunday is also recognized by the presence of the proper 'epistle' and the variation of the grail, intended to supplement the Mass *de Spiritu Sancto* which appears in full in another place. The presence of a collect, secret, and post-communion *in aliis dominicis* after the Easter Mass has apparently perplexed the editor more than would have been the case if he had realized the character of the book. He regards it, apparently, as an 'abridged missal,' and so no doubt it is; but the probable cause for the omission of so much which would be found in an ordinary missal seems to be, not, as he suggests, that the omitted matter was regarded as of less importance—so that, e.g., the feast of the Ascension was thought to be sufficiently recognized by the mention of the Ascension in the Whitsunday preface—but that the book was intended for use at a particular altar where a Mass *de die* was said only upon rare occasions. The special importance given to the festival of St. Vedast suggests that it was a principal feast in the church for which the book was written; the presence of proper Masses for the feasts of three Evangelists and the absence of a proper Mass for the feast of St. John suggest that the altar which the book was meant to serve was probably an altar of the four Evangelists in a Church which had also an altar of St. John. The forms for use in *in aliis dominicis* were pretty certainly not intended, as Mr. Turton supposes, to supersede the proper Masses for the Sundays between Easter and Pentecost, but to be used as a *memoria* during Easter-tide, in conjunction with the collect, secret, and post-communion of the Mass whatever it was, which was said at the minor altar on Sundays.

Mr. Turton finds, as one might expect, that the portion of the Ordinary of the Mass which his book contains is in more or less close agreement with the parallel portion of other books of like date. Beyond this fact, which does not carry us very far, there seems to be no particular ground for his notion that the book contains 'the germ of the subsequent English uses.' It differs considerably, even in this portion of its contents, from the earliest known Sarum missal, also of the thirteenth century; and there is a good deal of divergence from the Sarum forms in the Masses taken from the *Commune Sanctorum*. In fact, the editor's idea of the importance of his book as a whole seems to be mistaken. Nor is he much more happy in his estimate of the importance of particular portions of its contents. A



reference even to Chevalier's *Repertorium Hymnologicum* might have shewn him that the sequence *O crux lignum triumphale* is to be found in a good many books, and that it does not come from an Irish source, but from Adam of St. Victor; a little more insight would have enabled him to correct in the same sequence an error of the scribe which has rendered the meaning of one line 'obscure,' and might have prevented him from supposing that a 'unique rendering' of the *Agnus Dei* is really, although it has remained uncorrected, anything more than 'a scribal mistake.' It might also have led him to omit a good deal which is to be found in various parts of his introductory notes.

*Shrines of British Saints.* By J. CHARLES WALL. (London: Methuen and Co.) Price 7s. 6d.

MR. WALL has rightly seen that there still lingers romance in the memorials of the early saints. Their great deeds, magnified by popular reverence and enriched by growths of myth, were associated, either in fact or in the obstinate local hero-worship of uneducated but enthusiastic men, with special places, special treasures and relics. And then the shrines which sheltered their remains often grew into great churches and cathedrals; and all the social life of mediæval England, as Chaucer shews, was bound up with the visible memorials of holy men and women. So Mr. Wall had a promising subject, and if he had set himself more thoroughly to investigate local history he might certainly have given us a valuable and interesting book. As it is, his essay, though it is not scientific, and does not cover all the ground that we might have expected it to cover, is distinctly interesting in some aspects. Notably he collects much that is curious on the subject of reliquaries, and he illustrates his subject by well-chosen drawings. We may mention a few points of interest in his pages. He rightly calls attention to the fact that the mirth that has often been aroused at the number of arms or heads of a particular saint which are to be found in different places is due merely to a (no doubt natural) misconception of the fact that 'an "arm of S. Oswald" or a "head of S. Thomas" has from long custom been applied to a reliquary in that form, and containing, it may be, the merest fragment of a bone from that part of the saint's body.' The description of the sixteenth-century destruction of relics is sad reading, in regard to the mass of beautiful and precious work that is known to have perished; but the loss was not greater, we should be inclined to say, than that which the Crusaders caused in Constantinople in 1204. Even to-day, it would seem, reliquaries can be picked

up now and then in villages; we have a tale of one found in a cottage near Wells as 'one of the well-burnished ornaments of the chimney shelf.' The chief defect of the book is its want of ordinary historical criticism. It is annoying, for example, before a well-summarized account of the discoveries which have revealed the shrine and path of the early church of S. Frideswide at Oxford, to be told that this lady, of whom the earliest account is of the eleventh century, 'built the church at Oxford about 727'; and that 'Henry II. and his son' were present at the dedication of 'the present church' at Ely in 1252, when the youngest of them had been dead nearly forty years. What the book needed, in fact, was editing by some competent historian. The illustrations are, for the most part, quite excellent.

*Recent Discoveries illustrating Early Christian Life and Worship.*

Three Lectures delivered in the Chapter House of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh. By ARTHUR JOHN MACLEAN, D.D. [now Bishop of Moray and Ross.] (London: S.P.C.K. 1904.) Price 2s.

IN this modest little volume Dr. Maclean has attempted, and has carried out, as it seems to us, with marked success, a rather difficult piece of work. Recent discoveries of documents bearing on the Christian worship of the early centuries have been numerous and important; some of them have served to bring into prominence documents already known, which had hitherto received but little attention. The mutual relations of the documents are in some cases difficult to ascertain or to expound; and to set forth intelligibly, in a brief compass, without presupposing any special historical or liturgical knowledge on the part of the audience or the reader, the main results which may be gathered from the new material, either in itself or in conjunction with other documents, is no easy matter. Dr. Maclean's treatment of the subject is lucid, and his judgements, though perhaps here and there somewhat more decided than the evidence seems to us to warrant, are always sober and well grounded. It is perhaps natural that he should dwell on the *Testamentum Domini* rather more than its intrinsic importance seems to require; but though it may be doubted whether the provisions of the *Testamentum* were ever actually in force as a whole in any considerable Christian community, the document is certainly sufficiently remarkable to deserve attention. The book is a very useful contribution to the literature of the subject, containing much information in a small bulk, without such condensation as to render the lectures dull or unattractive.

## VII.—HYMNOLOGY AND MUSIC.

*The English Hymnal.* (Oxford : at the University Press. 1906.)  
Price 1s.

A RECENT article in our pages on *Hymns and Hymn-books*<sup>1</sup> was chiefly concerned with the new edition of the two best known collections of the English Church, *Hymns Ancient and Modern* and *Church Hymns*. Another collection has now appeared. It is larger than either of its predecessors, and its compilers claim to

'offer the book to all broad-minded men, in the hope that every one will find within these pages the hymns which he rightly wants. . . . It is not [they say] a party-book, expressing this or that phase of negation or excess, but an attempt to combine in one volume the worthiest expressions of all that lies within the Christian Creed, from those "ancient Fathers," who were the earliest hymn-writers, down to contemporary exponents of modern aspirations and ideals.'

This is a noble aim. A cursory examination of the book shews that the compilers have in a large measure attained their purpose. We come to the new book with gratitude and hope, expecting to question some things, to admire much, and to learn not a little.

Though it would be untrue to call either *Church Hymns* or *Hymns Ancient and Modern* a party book, each has a character of its own. Is it fanciful to say that *Hymns Ancient and Modern* reminds us of that text of the New Testament which critics call the Western? It is a collection which suits 'a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life'; its compilers are not scrupulous to preserve the original forms of hymns, or to uphold a high standard of poetry, but they have sympathy and common sense, and have presented to the multitude who, conscious of the joy of fellowship, are working manfully or suffering cheerfully, a manual of practical encouragement, solace and devotion. *Church Hymns* is rather the Alexandrian book. Its character has been impressed upon it by the delicate, poetic feeling of its compilers, who, as scholars, love to restore the original words of authors as far as their own disciplined taste allows, but do not eschew slight improvements when they think them necessary, and who feel perhaps an affection for those 'few places where old traditions of reserved and reticent worship still linger.' Their book is not, therefore, removed far from daily life, though its use is sweetest in the sanctuary. It is manly and simple; not the pedant's, but characteristically the scholar's, hymn-book.

<sup>1</sup> *C. Q. R.*, October 1905.

But neither the Western nor the Alexandrian character is complete. The book is still needed which will answer to the whole complex mind and activity of the Church. Will *The English Hymnal* do that? Its compilers meet an increasing demand, and they have done what is right in itself, in exercising a stricter faithfulness than their predecessors towards the original words of authors, though it is a pity they have not been even more faithful. How much vigour is here added to Montgomery's 'Hail to the Lord's Anointed' (45) by the inclusion of the fourth verse, 'Arabia's desert-ranger To him shall bow the knee.' How much truer is Wesley's thought 'A heart that always feels thy Blood So freely spilt for me' than the familiar 'A heart that's sprinkled with the Blood So freely shed for me' (82). The fourth verse of 'When I survey' (107) may sound strange to unaccustomed ears:

'His dying crimson like a robe,  
Spreads o'er his body on the Tree;  
Then am I dead to all the globe,  
And all the globe is dead to me.'

but Watts meant something by those lines, and they still ring true.

Do all the hymns in this collection ring true? It contains very many translations from the Latin. Read continuously they are almost uninteresting. Sung one by one they may seem better, but it is hard not to suspect something amiss. The imitations of Latin metres are certainly far from satisfying, and the elegiac renderings of 'Salve, festa dies' (624, 628, 630, 634) do not make up for the omission of Ellerton's paraphrase, 'Welcome, happy morning.' It may be granted that all do not feel alike about the use of translations, and it should be added that the admirable plan of printing the author's name and date above each hymn puts in clear light the debt we owe, not only to great translators like Neale (it is rather surprising to find no translation by Newman), but also to the ancient hymn-writers themselves. And yet the contrast is only more marked between the great translators and their followers, and (must it be confessed?) between the Latin hymns which flourish in an English atmosphere and the large number which somehow lose their charm, which no longer ring quite true. To notice one point only; it is well that prayers for, and (to use the technical term) invocations of departed saints, should be given in a hymn-book which is to touch the heart of the whole Church. To cease

remembering friends and masters in prayer, or to cease to speak to them, because they have passed into the larger mystery of life, could never be the general rule. But there is a certain propriety. In some way we must know the Saint for whom thanksgiving passes into prayer, and to whom we speak. Is it not false proportion if we sing to a 'Martyr,' 'Be thou on this thy holy-day Our strong upholder' (185), while no such word is addressed in this hymn-book to St. Paul, whom we know best of all those ancient heroes of the faith, or to the Bishop whom Mr. Stuckey Coles describes in his beautiful 'O Shepherd of the Sheep' (190), though he might be bound by most intimate affection to the singers? Ancient hymns do not always afford the surest means of recovering ancient doctrine, as will be apparent to those who turn from these translations—many of them so noble, but taken in the mass unsatisfactory—to the theological hymns of Bright, Keble, Alford, Heber, or Christopher Wordsworth. These can hardly be put on a level with the great mediæval authors, but they succeed them legitimately, and in an English book have a greatness of their own; however deep they go they are still understood, still felt.

In their nearness to the general heart, combined with their grandeur and spaciousness of thought, these men have even a kind of pre-eminence. But *The English Hymnal* is to be commended for including so much from older, and in many respects greater, English authors, such as Ken and Herbert, and among these Donne's 'Wilt thou forgive that sin, by man begun' (515) is most welcome. On the other hand, there is a large number of hymns which breathe a thoroughly modern spirit, and it is remarkable how various these are. Some are strenuous, rough-hewn in diction, like Mr. Chesterton's 'O God of earth and altar' (562); some terse with the careful simplicity of the new learning, such as the Dean of Westminster's hymn for the Transfiguration (236); one, Mr. A. C. Benson's hymn, 'In Time of War' (539), expresses in words of deep significance what many perplexed consciences have been inarticulately stammering during the last few years; but nearly all, with whatever differences, are marked by a directness of thought and utterance, which is no imitation of the antique style, but sincerely natural; the third verse of the Master of Trinity's 'Lift up your hearts' (429) is a good example:

'Above the swamps of subterfuge and shame,  
The deeds, the thoughts, that honour may not name,  
The halting tongue that dares not tell the whole,  
O Lord of Truth, lift every Christian soul!'

And for its straightforward, vigorous English Professor Burkitt's rendering of Nicholai's 'Wachet auf' (12) may be referred to as a pattern, perhaps as an earnest of a true revival of the art of translation.

Only a few of the many classes of hymns included in this collection have been noted. Its wide range is very delightful. Ancient and modern verse, stately chants for the solemnities of worship (with which the large and valuable collection of introits and anthems may be associated), and the pleadings of individual souls, bold phrases and restrained poetry, mission hymns like 'Hold the Fort' (570) and thoughtful theology, praise, prayer, delight in visible nature and searchings into the heart of man, all are to be found here. Some will wish that Canon Beeching's 'Hymn for a Boy' had been added. It may be objected that too much has been included, that poems like Christina Rossetti's 'In the bleak mid-winter' (25) are quite unfit for public worship. But the objection would not be just. The book is offered as 'a humble companion to the Book of Common Prayer for use in the Church,' and 'the Church' must not be confined to mean the building where public worship is celebrated. The Prayer Book is not only the book of public worship. It is also the best book of private devotions in the English language; and a good hymn-book should provide for the needs of the Churchman in his private prayers and meditations, of the parent reading to his children, of the parish-priest or hospital-chaplain in his visitations. *The English Hymnal* does make provision for all these needs, and though it will doubtless be revised again and again, as experiment shews the way, and though we have perhaps already strained too far at uniformity in hymnody as in other parts of worship, and it is not to be desired that *The English Hymnal* or another should become our one and only hymn-book, it nevertheless represents a laudable attempt to serve and educate the Church in England, and deserves a grateful welcome.

*Famous Hymns and their Authors.* By FRANCIS ARTHUR JONES.

With Portraits and Facsimiles. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1902.) Price 6s.

THE historical details which tell under what circumstances hymns were written have a biographical interest of an attractive kind, and Mr. Jones has spent some ten years in accumulating such materials, and has illustrated his letterpress with about fifty excellent portraits. But Miss Havergal, although the writer of many beautiful subjective pieces, has no right to the place of honour in the frontispiece. That



place should be given to Charles Wesley alone, the prince of English hymn-writers. But in spite of this and of other points which excite our criticism, we are sure that every hymn-lover will enjoy the perusal of Mr. Jones' book, and will like to see the house which was the birthplace of 'Abide with me' and where 'Our blest Redeemer' was written, and to look both at the facsimiles, and the portraits of the authors of so many well-known hymns.

*Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians.* Second Edition.

Edited by J. A. FULLER MAITLAND. Vol. II. F-L. (Macmillan and Co. 1906.) Price 21s.

MUSICIANS will welcome the appearance of the second volume of the new edition of *Grove's Dictionary*, which maintains the high standard of scholarship exhibited by its predecessor. The new instalment is not altogether without faults; we may point to the contributions on 'Finale' and 'Intermezzo' as examples of articles which seem to have escaped the editor's eye. Both are by authors now dead (John Hullah and W. S. Rockstro), who represent the point of view of a generation ago. Hullah's article, indeed, contains some allusions to Wagner which at the present day are merely ridiculous. Moreover, recent research has shewn that the conclusions reached in those days were on some points quite untrue, and it is a pity that erroneous ideas should still be supported by so distinguished an authority. An article on 'Hydaspes' causes us to wonder whether the editor is right in retaining the short entries under the names of operas. To us it seems that the space which they occupy might be turned to better account. It is impossible for a dictionary of this kind to compete with the *Dictionnaire Lyrique* of Clément and Larousse, and if the operas mentioned have to be limited to those of some importance, surely they would be better treated either under the heading of their composers or, in occasional cases, under the headings of the theatres at which they were performed. The particular case named also leads us to express the hope that a future volume will give us a thoroughly scientific account of the 'Pasticcio' and its extraordinary vogue in London, with a careful and accurate bibliography of these entertainments, which are a source of much confusion to musical historians.

So many articles in the present volume deserve praise that we can mention only a few of them here. Mr. G. E. P. Arkwright's article on the 'Ferrabosco' family is a model of sound historical research. M. Hugues Imbert contributes an interesting

notice of 'César Franck,' a composer whose greatness has only recently begun to be appreciated. Dr. Vaughan-Williams' article on 'Fugue' is of considerable importance, as it treats the subject from a thoroughly modern point of view, including an example from Richard Strauss, which shews that even the severest of musical studies can be discussed with a sense of humour. It was, however, a wise proceeding to retain part of Rockstro's original article, since that gave a clear exposition of the formal scholastic fugue, a knowledge of which is necessary to the understanding of Dr. Vaughan-Williams' essay. The next letter of the alphabet brings us two very important articles on subjects of considerable difficulty—Greek Music and Gregorian Music. Mr. H. S. Macran's treatment of the former is not only very full of information, but also exhibits a masterly clearness of arrangement, for which students, bewildered by the conflicting theories of various scholars, will certainly be deeply grateful. The music of the primitive Church could find no better historian than the Rev. W. H. Frere, who approaches the subject as a scientific investigator and as one to whom plain-song is a living musical language. This is a welcome change after the articles of the late Mr. Rockstro, who always appeared to let his æsthetic faculties be swamped by a gushing enthusiasm for mediæval ecclesiasticism, which found its expression in a pompous literary style diversified with a plethora of unnecessary capital letters. In the article 'Hymn' we find the two writers in conjunction, Rockstro's interest in hymnology having practically ended with Palestrina. Mr. Frere's want of sympathy with the melodious and eminently vocal hymn-tunes of the eighteenth century is not surprising, but it is none the less to be regretted; the tunes of the nineteenth century might well have been judged with more severity.

A most valuable contribution is that of Mr. W. H. Hadow, who has thoroughly revised and brought up to date the article on Haydn written by C. P. Pohl. Mr. Hadow has already made himself known as a Haydn scholar by his little book, *A Croatian Composer*, and for this article he has undertaken long and careful research, the results of which he has laid before the reader with his accustomed felicity of style. Parallel to Dr. Vaughan-Williams' treatise on 'Fugue' we have those of Mr. Corder on 'Instrumentation' and of Dr. Walford Davies on 'Invertible Counterpoint.' Mr. Corder has brought his article thoroughly up to date, and his point of view is always original and interesting. He has selected examples with care,

and no better lesson on instrumentation could be given than the comparison between the methods of Berlioz and Weingartner in scoring Weber's 'Invitation à la Valse.' Dr. Walford Davies is more than interesting—he is inspiring, and it is tiresomely tantalizing to be put off with a reference to articles to follow in subsequent volumes when we have been stimulated to desire the thorough discussion of interesting points. Surely no one could read his articles without wishing to become the pupil of a master who can infuse such splendid life into the branch of study which to most musical students is merely dry and irksome. We hope that Dr. Walford Davies will some day give us a complete treatise on counterpoint in all its branches.

Lastly, we must mention the revised article on 'Musical Libraries,' the work of Mr. Barclay Squire, whose knowledge of musical bibliography is unsurpassed, certainly in this country, and probably on the Continent as well. To anyone undertaking musical research work this article will be a most valuable guide to all the important collections of the world.

#### VIII.—EDUCATION.

##### *Studies in the History of Educational Opinion from the Renaissance.*

By S. S. LAURIE, Professor of the Institutes and History of Education, University of Edinburgh. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1903.)

THOUGH this book in places betrays the lecture form by blemishes of style, it is full of interest. The chapters on Ascham, Comenius and Locke may be singled out as good specimens of the author's power. On the other hand, the account of the Jesuits is disappointingly short. The analysis of the Renaissance movement is clear, and the astonishing predominance of Latin in education is again and again emphasized. The writer makes many shrewd thrusts at secondary schoolmasters; but they may fairly retort that much of his book, as indeed of many other educational books, has nothing to do with class-teaching. It would be comparatively easy to teach Queen Elizabeth a good deal if one had her undivided attention; and though both Montaigne and Locke say much on education which sets one thinking, they had no experience as schoolmasters.

##### *Desiderius Erasmus concerning the Aim and Method of Education.*

By W. H. WOODWARD, Professor of Education in the University of Liverpool. (Cambridge University Press. 1904.) Price 4s. net.

THE book falls into two main divisions. Part I. opens with a fresh and discriminating sketch of Erasmus' literary career, which, in

the light of recent research, contradicts some long-cherished beliefs ; this is followed by sections on his characteristics, educational aims and methods. These scholarly chapters give a sufficient setting and orientation for Part II., which comprises translations of two systematic educational treatises, the *De Ratione Studii* and the *Libellus de Pueris Instituendis*, a model letter (2 pp.) on reading, in the original Latin, from the *De Conscribendis Epistolis*, and an excerpt translated from one of the 'Colloquies.' A chronological outline, two bibliographies and an index form a useful apparatus.

It will be gathered that the monograph presents but one aspect of Erasmus' life and work ; but, since that work was, first and last, a strenuous attempt to humanize sixteenth-century society, Professor Woodward is more than justified in describing Erasmus' pedagogical labours as ' of profound importance ' and eminently characteristic of the man.

The publication of such a book as this is opportune at a time when school courses are being framed and methods and ' educational values ' discussed, too often with scanty reference to principles. Here, if the disputants would cease talking and turn to thinking for a while, they might discover from the historical standpoint what are the true aims of literary culture and how abiding the need for their attainment in whatever changes of political circumstance or material environment. Not a few ' methodizers ' might also be brought to a wholesome humility were they to note how many inventions of to-day, or the day before, were anticipated by Erasmus and other students of Quintilian. On the other hand, the reader of this book may learn to distinguish true humanism from false, and to realize the mischief which has been wrought in education through permitting every petty trafficker in Latin Grammar to pose as a humanist. Erasmus' quarrel with the Ciceronians is an excellent illustration of the fact that the pedant follows all too closely on the heels of the scholar. The fatuous superior person, despising his mother-tongue, ignoring all advance in knowledge not chronicled in Latin or Greek, blind to the differences between ancient and modern life, did not, unhappily, become extinct in the sixteenth century. He too often became a schoolmaster or a power in the University and used his position to hinder salutary educational reforms, sheltering himself meanwhile behind the pretext of sound letters. Professor Woodward's most interesting book is to be welcomed as providing those concerned (and who are not ?) with an excellent occasion for pondering some fundamental questions.

*Pioneers of Modern Education 1600-1700.* By J. W. ADAMSON, Professor of Education, King's College, London. (Cambridge: at the University Press. 1905.) Price 4s. 6d. net:

'THE main theme' of Professor Adamson's book (pref. vi) 'is the introduction of "modern studies" into the school course and the breaking down of the monopoly vested by force of circumstance, and not always with express intention, in the ancient languages.' The general impression, however, produced by the perusal of the book is (what is also stated as one purpose why it was written) the conviction that the seventeenth century had a great share in formulating 'the fundamental ideas of the pedagogy of our time,' such, for example, as 'the expediency of state-provided systems of education, universal and compulsory,' or the introduction of science and modern languages into curricula.

The book begins with an interesting chapter on the relation of Bacon to the scientific discoveries of his age, which might, perhaps, be criticized as not closely connected with the main subject. The strong point of the book consists in the contact into which it brings the reader with 'the actual practice reformed and unreformed' of the school-room in the early seventeenth century, as 'described on the authority of those who knew it at first hand' (pref. viii). We become acquainted with such men as Brinsley and Hook in our own country. Second-rate men as they were, they were at any rate practically successful; what they tell us about methods is more useful than pages of *a priori* reasoning by persons who have had no experience of teaching.

The author's style is easy and readable; he succeeds in making the dry bones of his subject live. Chapter x. on the 'courtly academies' is especially interesting to those who are intimate with their analogues in modern English life in the public schools. Perhaps Professor Adamson is most successful in dealing with the greatest men of his period, Comenius and de la Salle. The part of the book which in view of the controversies of to-day churchmen will read with the most interest is that which deals with the origin of 'voluntaryism' (chapters xi.-xiii.). One is tempted to sigh over the vanity of things human when one reads that in such and such a year in one town of France or another 'the Brothers' opened a school. How many thousands of children there were at the same time in France who were growing up without any education! We do

VOL. LXIII.—NO. CXXV.

R

not wish to undervalue education so much as to point out the slowness with which things move. Happy, perhaps, were the enthusiasts for education of whom this book writes that they did not take extended views of things, but were content to work piecemeal. Their hopefulness and self-devotion in the face of difficulties of all kinds were glorious and heroic. It was not till 1870 that our own country adopted a system of compulsory education; Comenius had proved the necessity of such a system in the 'Great Didactic' written between 1628 and 1632!

The last chapter, though it recurs to the 'main theme,' seems to us disappointing from being so sketchy and jerky in its treatment. And we must confess to feeling little interest in Rathe, Hartlib and Dury. We are quite willing to accept Professor Adamson's reasons for exploding Rathe's claim to distinction; Hartlib seems to have been rather a windbag, and Dury a dull dog. We would fain in their place have heard a little more about that French education which the author allows (p. 258) to have been the best in the seventeenth century; more about the Oratorians and their famous academy of Juilly; more about the Gentlemen of the Port Royal. There is just enough reference to them in the last chapter to convict our ignorance and whet our desire for more knowledge.

We have no space to refer in detail to many small points of interest by the way: such, for example, as Comenius' argument for believing that there must have been a school, but a bad one, in Paradise (p. 56) or the history of the notion 'of the three R's' (p. 209 and elsewhere). The book concludes with an exhaustive list of publications referred to in the text and a good index. We should like an explanation of a phrase found on p. 208 and elsewhere: 'Casting accompts by the great.' One small point of style: is 'says Comenius' (p. 53) an idiom which Mr. Adamson wishes to make usual among us? It occurs three times in his book; whenever we hear a quotation so introduced, as it often is in the modern sermon, we must confess to a shiver. It is worse to our mind than the historic present of the *Daily Mail*.

*Personal and Ideal Elements in Education.* By H. C. KING.  
(London: Macmillan and Co. 1904.) Price 6s. 6d.

THE author of this book is one who could be trusted to preach a long sermon. Certain ideas which he feels strongly, such as the importance of action in life and the need for respecting the personality of other men in our religious dealings with them



recur in these pages. There are men who keep themselves efficient by hurling platitudes at audiences. The most interesting part of the book deals with the 'Revival' question. The author has thought the matter out and puts the case well for and against Revivals. Like most American writers, the author is hopeful. 'It is a reasonable expectation that the best religious teaching and the best response to religious teaching that the world has ever seen lie just ahead of us' (p. 119). He welcomes warmly the historical spirit. 'Have we felt the tremendous significance of the fact that every Life of Christ worth reading, outside the Gospels, has been written since 1835' (p. 205)? His own message is well put in pp. 229-235: 'the conception of the religious life as a personal relation with the personal God.'

*The Christ in the Teacher.* By J. H. SKRINE. (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1905.) Price 1s. 6d. net.

THIS little volume contains four addresses given in the chapel of Keble College, Oxford, in January 1905 to a devotional meeting of persons interested in secondary education. Mr. Skrine is always a thoughtful writer, with an arresting gift of language. Here he raises his hearers to a high plane, endeavouring to shew how the Incarnation can be the teacher's guide in three lines, Thought, Emotion, Action. 'We are the conveyers of a tradition which is life: our work is more than a doctrine, more even than a discipline; it is to make our disciples not learn but live; and only as we live ourselves can we enable life in them' (p. 45). Though the treatment is mystical at times, and scarcely full enough to exhaust its high text, the book will do the reader good. It is the utterance of one whose view of life is sane and broad, who is not afraid of 'the so-called higher criticism,' and who does not despair of 'days of transition' like the present.

#### PERIODICALS.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. VII. No. 28. July 1906. Frowde). R. H. Kennett: 'The Date of Deuteronomy' and 'The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood: a Reply.' T. Barns: 'Some Creed Problems.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Codex Taurinensis (Y), V.' E. O. Winstedt: 'The Original Text of one of St. Antony's Letters' [from the Coptic MS., Naples 1, B. 1, 3] and 'A Further Note on Cosmas.' C. Taylor: 'The Oxyrhynchus and other Agrapha.' M. R. James: 'Notes on Apocrypha' ('Revillout, *Les Apocryphes Coptes*, 'A. E. Medlycott, *India and the Apostle Thomas*'). A. Souter: 'Prolegomena to the Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St. Paul.' J. A. Nairn: 'On the Text of the

*De Sacerdotio* of St. Chrysostom.' C. H. Turner: 'Adversaria Patristica.' H. A. Redpath: 'The Dates of the Translation of the various Books of the LXX.' H. Stuart Jones: 'The Catacomb of Commodilla.' G. H. Skipwith: 'The Image of God.' Dom E. C. Butler: 'Rampolla, *Santa Melania giuniore*.'

*The Expositor* (N.S. Nos. 7-9. July-September 1906. Hodder and Stoughton). G. A. Smith: 'Ezra and Nehemiah.' D. S. Margoliouth: 'Dr. Orr on the Problem of the Old Testament.' W. M. Ramsay: 'Tarsus' (continued August-September). W. Knight: 'The Site of Capernaum.' Khan Minyeh. W. H. Bennett: 'The Life of Christ according to St. Mark' (continued). J. H. A. Hart: 'The Scribes of the Nazarenes.' J. Moffatt: 'Notes on Recent New Testament Study.' August: J. H. Moulton: 'Synoptic Studies: I. The Beatitudes.' A. Carr: 'St. Paul's Rule of Life.' G. A. Smith: 'Nehemiah's Jerusalem.' D. M. McIntyre: 'The Mystical Doctrine of Christ.' N. J. D. White: 'The Unchangeableness of Jesus Christ in Relation to Christian Doctrine.' S. A. Cook: 'Old Testament Notes.' September. G. A. Smith: 'The Jewish Constitution from Nehemiah to the Maccabees.' V. Bartlet: 'Melito on the Muratorian Canon.' H. T. F. Duckworth: 'The Origin of the Book of Daniel.' G. B. Gray: 'The Alphabetic Structure of Psalms IX. and X.' H. Black: 'Personal Religious Influence.' J. Stalker: 'What is "the Communion of the Holy Ghost"?'

*The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. IV. No. 4. July 1906. Williams and Norgate). Sir O. Lodge: 'First Principles of Faith: a Basis for Religious Teaching.' Invents a new Catechism. W. J. Knox Little: 'Denominationalism and Undenominationalism and the Church of England: a Criticism of the Article by the Bishop of Carlisle.' H. A. Garnett: 'An Anglican Layman's Plain Plea for the Separation of the Creeds from Worship.' H. B. Gray: 'The Teaching of the Christian Religion in Public Schools.' H. Jones: 'The Working Faith of a Social Reformer: IV. The Coming of Socialism.' D. H. Macgregor: 'The Great Fallacy of Idealism.' R. H. Smith: 'Japanese Character and its probable Influence outside Japan.' P. T. Forsyth: 'A Rallying Ground for the Free Churches: the Reality of Grace.' K. C. Anderson: 'Why not Face the Facts? An Appeal to Protestants.' C. E. Stephen: 'Signs and Wonders in Divine Guidance.' E. Gittins: 'The Sufferings of the Saints.' B. W. Bacon: 'Gospel Types in Primitive Tradition.' Discussions. Reviews. Bishop of Ripon: '*Memoirs of Archbishop Temple*.' J. Herkless: 'Dudden, *Gregory the Great*.' L. R. Farnell: 'J. G. Frazer, *Early History of the Kingship*.' W. Jones-Davies: 'Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*,' and 'Bousset, *Jesus*' (E. T.). F. C. S. Schiller: 'Santayana, *The Life of Reason*.' A. S. Furnell: 'A. F. Mitchell, *How to Teach the Bible*.'

*The American Journal of Theology* (Vol. X. No. 3. July 1906. University of Chicago Press). W. A. Brown: 'Changes in the Theology of American Presbyterianism.' H. P. Smith: 'The Old Testament Theory of Atonement.' W. C. Keirstead: 'Theological Presuppositions of Ritschl.' J. W. Richard: 'The Church and Divorce.' H. A. Thompson: 'The Catholic Cultus of the Virgin Mary.' H. Preble and S. M. Jackson: 'Bernard of Cluny, *The Scorn of the World*,' E. T. (continued). G. A. Tawney: 'Busse, *Geist und Körper, Leib und Seele*,' and 'C. A.

Strong, *Why has the Mind a Body?*' A. C. Zenos, and P. Gardner: 'G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion.*' G. D. Walcott: 'Gastrow, J. S. Semler in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie,' and 'Zscharnack, Lessing und Semler.' G. H. Gilbert: 'Karo, J. S. Semler in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie.' G. B. Foster: 'A. Sabatier, *The Doctrine of the Atonement and Religion and Modern Culture*' (E. T.), and 'Bousset, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?*' H. M. Bowden: 'R. M. Adamson, *The Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.*' 'E. W. Mayer, *Christentum und Kultur.*' J. H. Ropes: 'C. M. Mead, *Irenic Theology: a Study of some Antitheses of Religious Thought.*' W. C. Keirstead: 'Lüdemann, *Biblical Christianity*' (E. T.), and 'Ostwald, *Individuality and Immortality.*' T. C. Hall: 'The Message of the Modern Pulpit.' Reviews 'Remensnyder, *The Atonement and Modern Thought,*' and 'J. A. Picton, *The Religion of the Universe.*' C. R. Henderson: 'C. Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London. III. Religious Influences.*' G. A. Barton: 'F. J. Bliss, *The Development of Palestine Exploration.*'

*The Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. IV. No. 3. July 1906. Philadelphia: MacCalla and Co.). G. Vos: 'Christian Faith and the Truthfulness of Bible History.' W. B. Greene, jun.: 'Broad Churchism and the Christian Life.' D. Beaton: '"The Marrow of Modern Divinity" and the Marrow Controversy.' J. Lindsay: 'The Development of Scottish Theology.' F. W. Loetscher: 'Schwenckfeld's Participation in the Eucharistic Controversy of the Sixteenth Century, I.' Reviews. H. C. Minton: 'C. C. Hall, *The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion*'; 'Ballard, *Haeckel's Monism False*'; 'Gratacap, *The World as Intention: a Contribution to Teleology*'; 'W. R. Nicoll, *The Garden of Nuts.*' W. B. Greene, jun., 'Schultz, *Outlines of Christian Apologetics*'; 'G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion*'; 'E. Y. Mullins, *Why is Christianity True? Christian Evidences.*' 'L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion: its Genesis and Growth*'; 'R. C. Wylie, *Sabbath Laws in the United States.*' J. D. Davis: 'H. L. Strack, *Die Genesis*'; 'F. C. Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers.*' G. Vos: 'F. Bohn, *Der Sabbat im Alten Testament*'; 'R. T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash.*' B. B. Warfield: 'Jeremias, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament.*' F. W. Loetscher: 'Schmidt-Meusel, *A. H. Franches Briefe an den Grafen Heinrich XXIV j. L. Reuss (1704-1727)*'; 'Dexter, *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*'; 'Hoyt, *The Work of Preaching*'; G. F. Greene: 'J. Watson, *The Inspiration of our Faith*'; P. Martin: 'Parsons, *Christus Liberator: an Outline Study of Africa*'; and 'Zahn, *Bread and Salt from the Word of God* (E. T.).' C. R. Erdman: 'H. M. Gwatkin, *The Eye for Spiritual Things.*'

*The Dublin Review* (Vol. CXXXIX. No. 278. July 1906. Burns and Oates). W. Barry: 'Our Latin Bible.' W. Ward: 'Henry Sidgwick.' Lord Llandaff: 'Matilda of Tuscany.' J. S. Phillimore: 'Crinagoras of Mitylene.' 'Catholic Social Effort in France.' 'The Syrian Christians in India.' Most Rev. L. C. Casartelli (Bishop of Salford): 'The Plaint of the Kine: the Second *Gatha* of the Avesta.' Dom. J. Chapman: 'The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.' 'Denominationalism and the Education Bill.' Reviews. 'Duchesne, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise, I.*' W. W[ard]: 'G. Tyrrell, *Lex Credendi.*' B. C. A. W[indle]: 'J. B. Burke,

*The Origin of Life.* Crushing. 'T. de Régnon, *La Métaphysique des causes d'après Saint Thomas et Albert le Grand.*' Eulogistic. 'H. Thurston, *The Stations of the Cross.*' Noteworthy. 'Dom. C. Edmonds, *The Early Scottish Church.*' 'W. R. Inge, *Studies of the English Mystics.*'

*The Interpreter* (Vol. II. No. 4. July 1906. Simpkin, Marshall). W. Lock: 'The Teaching of the Book of Job.' University sermon. V. F. Storr: 'Conscience as a Witness to God.' J. H. Moulton: 'Egyptian Rubbish-Heaps and the Study of the New Testament.' The Author of *The Faith of a Christian*: 'Christ's Consciousness of His Relation to God.' E. P. Boys-Smith: 'The Parochial Clergy and Modern Criticism.' C. L. Broun: 'The Problem of Prayer.' W. E. McFarlane: 'Sex in Relation to Religion.' Reviews. 'Bousset, *Jesus*' (E. T.). 'H. von Soden, *History of Early Christian Literature*' (E. T.). 'Patrick, *James the Lord's Brother.*' 'Storr, *Development and Divine Purpose.*' 'Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels.*' 'N. H. Marshall, *Theology and Truth.*' 'Overton-Relton, *The English Church, 1714-1800.*' 'J. D. James, *The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles.*' 'Bedwell, *The Increase of the Episcopate.*' 'G. H. S. Walpole, *Personality and Power.*' 'Conversations with Christ.'

*The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Vol. XVIII. No. 72. July 1906. Macmillan & Co.). I. Elbogen: 'Studies in the Jewish Liturgy.' H. Hirschfeld: 'The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge,' XIII. Hebrew Text and translations. D. Philipson: 'The Reform Movement in Judaism, VII. The Breslau Rabbinical Conference.' M. N. Adler: 'The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela' (concluded). With facsimiles. L. Ginzberg: 'Geonic Responsa.' Hebrew Texts. G. H. Skipwith: 'Ashtoreth, the Goddess of the Zidonians.' S. A. Cook: 'Notes on Old Testament History. V. Meribath-Kadesh.' G. Margoliouth: 'Gunzburg-Stassof, *L'Ornement Hébraïque.*' A. Marx: 'Notes on J. Q. R., xviii. 399 ff.' I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica.'

*The Expository Times* (Vol. XVII. Nos. 10-12. July-September 1906. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark). E. G. King: 'The Sabbath in the Light of the Higher Criticism.' A. E. Garvie: 'The New Method of Studying the Bible,' IV. (continued August.) H. A. A. Kennedy: 'Moulton's *New Testament Grammar.*' C. Field: 'The Master Mystic.' Jalaluddin Rumi. 'W. L. Walker, *Christian Theism.*' '(The late) Sir C. W. Wilson, *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre.*' 'W. H. Fitchett, *Wesley and his Century.*' 'Religious, Ethical and Theological Articles in the Periodicals of 1905.' A. H. Sayce: 'Recent Biblical Archaeology: The Rivers of Paradise.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Dioscurism in the O. T.' J. R. Taylor: 'The White Stone of the Apocalypse and the Vote of Saul of Tarsus against the Christians.' W. J. Ferrar: 'Note on Matt. vii. 9.' E. Nestle: 'Some Corrections of Plummer on St. Luke' (continued August). A. S. Lewis: 'The Sinai Palimpsest, Matt. xx. 15.' August. 'H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God.*' J. A. MacCulloch: 'The Religion of Palaeolithic Man.' A. A. Brockington: 'Miracles as Signs.' A. J. Maclean: 'Batifol, *La Question Biblique dans l'Anglicanisme,*' and 'Dimnet, *La Pensée Catholique dans l'Angleterre contemporaine.*' H. R. Mackintosh: 'Seeberg, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte.*' A. H. Sayce: 'Archæology of Genesis xiv.' E. König: 'A Modern Jonah.' Notable. A. L. Reed: 'St. Mark

xii. 29 b.' W. D. Morris: 'Task Work (2 Sam. xx. 24).' J. Baikie: 'Petrie's Researches in Sinai.' September. L. R. M. Strachan: 'G. A. Deissmann.' J. Taylor: 'Marti, *Die Religion des A. T.*' J. S. Banks: 'R. Otto, *Naturalistische in religiöser Weltansicht.*' A. H. Sayce: 'N. Ter-Mikaëlian, *Das armenische Hymnarium,*' and 'F. Blass, *Die Rhythmen der asianischen u. römischen Kunstprosa.*' R. J. Drummond: 'Forrest's *Authority of Christ.*' J. V. Prašek: 'W. Erbt, *Die Hebräer.*' 'A. W. Benn, *History of English Rationalism.*' 'H. H. Joachim, *The Nature of Truth.*' 'H. Sturt, *Idola Theatri.*' J. Boehmer: 'The Name "Ahab."' E. Nestle: 'The Gospel Headings in the Authorized Version' and 'Hebrews xii. 24.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Babylonian Sabbath.'

*The Liberal Churchman* (No. 6. July 1906. Williams and Norgate). H. Rashdall: 'A Plea for Undenominationalism.' R. H. Newton: 'The Church in the United States.' W. Routh: 'Lay Influence in Church Concerns.' Reviews. 'Henslow, *The Spiritual Teaching of Christ's Life.*' 'E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar.*' 'Schultz, *Outlines of Christian Apologetics,*' and 'Darwell Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma.*' Hermann, *The Communion of the Christian with God.*' 'P. N. Waggett, *The Scientific Temper in Religion.*'

*The Review and Expositor* (Vol. III. No. 3. July 1906. Louisville, Ky.). J. H. Farmer: 'The Main Purpose of the Apocalypse.' A. H. Sayce: 'Moses in Archaeology and Criticism.' I. M. Price: 'Some Phases of the Ethical Character of the Old Testament and the Ethics of Ancient Oriental Peoples.' F. W. Moore: 'The Sociological Concept.' A. M. Fairbairn: 'The Theological Problems and Historical Persons of Nicæa.' W. Hoyt: 'The Use of the Scriptures in Theology.' Reviews. G. B. Eager: 'C. C. Hall, *Christian Belief interpreted by Christian Experience.*' 'World-famous.' A. T. Robertson: 'Friedländer, *Die Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu*'; 'Bousset, *Jesus* (E. T.); 'C. A. Scott, *Book of Revelation*'; 'E. A. Abbot, *Johannine Grammar*' and '*Johannine Vocabulary*'; 'Nageli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*'; 'E. Bischoff, *Jesus und die Rabbinen*'; 'Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek.*' W. O. Carver: 'G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion*'; 'G. T. Ladd, *The Philosophy of Religion.*' E. Y. Mullins: 'F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and Christian Character.*' J. R. Sampey: 'McFadyen, *Introduction to the Old Testament.*' 'W. J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise.*'

*The Independent Review* (Vol. X. Nos. 34-6. July-September 1906. Unwin). J. M. Wilson: 'The Education Bill: a Lost Opportunity.' A. P. Laurie: 'The Report of the Haldane Committee.' S. A. Barnett: 'The Press and Charitable Funds.' C. C. Michaelides: 'The Paintings of Gustave Moreau.' J. M. Robertson: 'A. W. Benn, *History of English Rationalism.*' G. L. Strachey: 'Birkbeck Hill, *Johnson's "Lives of the Poets."*' G. Lowes Dickinson: '*The Arbiter in Council.*' August. M. E. and J. R. MacDonald: 'Sweated Home Industries.' M. McMillan: 'Citizens of To-morrow.' Needs of Children. A. Hallard: 'Renan's Early Note Books.' F. M. Stawell: 'Schopenhauer, Pessimism and Art.' F. W. Maitland: 'The Making of the German Civil Code.' September. J. L. Hammond: 'Charles James Fox.' C. Trevelyan: 'The Case for Women's Suffrage.' J. H. Wicksteed: 'Progress and the Final

Goal.' C. C. Osborne: 'Mr. Pecksniff and his Prototype.' G. L. Strachey: 'De Ségur, *Julie de Lespinasse*.'

*The Edinburgh Review* (No. 417. July 1906. Longmans). 'Lord Randolph Churchill.' 'Illuminism and the French Revolution.' 'The Novels of Mr. Marion Crawford.' 'An Illustrious Cavalier.' Ormond. 'Alfred de Musset, Poet.' 'Memoirs of the Whig Party.' 'A Representative Philosopher.' Descartes. 'Viterbo.' 'Rationalism and Apologetic.' 'Marino Falier.' 'The New Parliament and the Educational Controversy.'

*The Quarterly Review* (No. 408. July 1906. John Murray). 'The Cry of the Children.' W. L. Jones: 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Legend of Arthur.' R. Dunlop: 'The Origin of the Irish Race.' 'Northumberland.' 'Modern British Art and the Nation.' 'The First Year of the Boer War.' R. S. Rait: 'John Knox and the Scottish Reformation.' 'The Origin and Historical Basis of the Oxford Movement.' 'The Literature of Egotism.' 'The Government of the Church.' 'The Government, the Session, and the Education Bill.'

*The Classical Review* (Vol. XX. No. 6. July 1906. Nutt). W. T. Lendrum: '"Moth and Rust"—a Classical Image.' Matt. vi. 20 compared with Pindar, Frag. 222 (243). H. R. Hall: 'Newberry, *Scarabs*.' P. Gardner: 'Furtwängler, *Ägina: das Heiligtum der Aphaia*.' F. H. Marshall: 'W. Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit*,' and 'J. B. Carter, *The Religion of Numa*.'

*The Contemporary Review* (Nos. 487-489. July-September 1906. Horace Marshall). W. M. Ramsay: 'The War of Moslem and Christian for the Possession of Asia Minor' (Rede Lecture, 1906). Sir A. E. Pease: 'The Native Question in the Transvaal.' Sir O. Lodge: 'Squandering a Surplus.' H. Spender: 'The Great Congo Iniquity.' L. Jerrold: 'French Politics and the French People.' E. F. Caillard: 'The World of Personal Spirits.' J. J. Findlay: 'The Teachers' Register.' G. Barlow: 'The Fall of Woman.' G. G. Coulton: 'The Truth about the Monasteries: a Rejoinder.' P. Sabatier: 'Religious Events in France.' 'A Reader': 'R. B. Perry, *The Approach to Philosophy*;' 'J. M. McTaggart, *Some Dogmas of Religion*;' 'H. Sturt, *Idola Theatri*;' 'H. Sidgwick, *The Philosophy of Kant*;' 'Bedwell, *Increase of the Episcopate*.' August. A. Yusuf-Ali: 'Goethe's Orientalism.' 'Socialism in France: the Parliamentary Duel between MM. Jaurès and Clemenceau.' A. S. Barnes: 'The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer' (continued September). M. Loane: 'Culture among the Poor.' H. Hensley Henson: 'The Ecclesiastical Discipline Report (concluded September)' L. March-Phillips: 'Form and Colour.' 'A Reader': 'H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*;' 'W. R. Inge, *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*;' 'A. W. Benn, *History of English Rationalism*;' 'J. B. Carter, *The Religion of Numa*;' 'Overton-Relton, *History of the English Church, 1714-1800*;' 'Fitchett, *Wesley and his Century*;' 'Loliée, *Short History of Comparative Literature*.' September. (The late) H. Ibsen: 'The Saga and the Ballad.' C. Simmons: 'The Preparatory Day School of the Future.' E. Martinengo Cesaresco: 'A Religion of Ruth.' The Jainas. E. Givskor: 'Home-Industry and Peasant-Farming in Belgium.' 'A Reader': 'N. H. Thompson, *Machiavelli's Florentine History*;' 'J. Williams, *Dante as Jurist*.'



*The Catholic World* (Vol. LXXXIII. Nos. 496, 8. July, September 1906. New York). P. J. Healy: 'Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*.' L. I. Guiney: 'Childhood in English Seventeenth Century Poetry.' F. A. Gasquet: 'Some Letters of Father Hecker.' K. Brégy: 'Lionel Johnson: Poet and Critic.' W. F. Dennehy: 'Ireland under Charles II.: his Policy towards Catholics.' Reviews. 'H. Brémond, *Newman: essai de Biographie psychologique*.' 'Poulain, *Des Grâces d'Oraison*.' 'G. Tyrrell, *Lex Credendi*.' September. 'Non-Catholic Work in Franciscan Studies.' M. Turmann: 'The Religious Situation in France.' A. M. F. Cole: 'The Expectation of the Convert.' W. F. Dennehy: 'Philip, Duke of Wharton.' L. I. Quiney: 'Newman's Littlemore.' 'Susceptible Americans, male and female, have been known to weep there.' Hogan, *Irish Catholics and Trinity College*. McKim, *The Problem of the Pentateuch*. 'Dimnet, *La Pensée Catholique dans l'Angleterre contemporaine*.' Very favourable.

*The Monthly Review* (Nos. 70-72. July-September 1906. John Murray). S. A., and J. B. Knowles: 'The Race Question in South Africa.' A. J. Bliss: 'Hybridisation and Plant-Breeding.' C. A. Cameron: 'The Need for Social Reform in Russia.' C. B. Newland: 'Instinct in Birds, Animals, and Insects.' August. 'Recollections of a Board School Teacher.' L. Melville: 'Charles James Fox.' S. G. Ford: 'The Poetry of Nora Chesson.' R. B. Douglas: 'The Folk-Lore of Paris.' K. Blind: 'Homeric Knowledge of the High North.' 'D. R. MacIver, *Medieval Rhodesia*.' September. L. Jerrold: 'England, France, and Socialism.' A. Symons: 'Walter Pater.' H. Reid: 'Antonio Fogazzaro.' F. W. Blunt: 'The Mutiny at Vellore, July 1806.' V. de M.: 'Clerical Feeling in French Canada.' C. Snyder: 'The Quest of Prolonged Youth.' S. L. Bastin: 'The Effects of Civilisation upon Climate.' F. Carrel: 'The Human State.' A. H. Fisher: 'J. F. Millet.'

*The English Historical Review* (Vol. XXI. No. 83. July 1906. Longmans). G. H. Orpen: 'Mote and Bretesche Building in Ireland.' J. Nisbet: 'The History of the Forest of Dean.' J. F. Chance: 'The Northern Question in 1718.' W. A. B. Coolidge: 'Charles the Great's Passage of the Alps in 773.' W. H. Stevenson: 'An Inedited Charter of Henry I., 1101.' At Lincoln. G. T. Lapsley: 'The Flemings in Eastern England in the Reign of Henry II.' W. Miller: 'Ithake under the Franks.' B. H. Putnam: 'The Justices of Labourers in the Fourteenth Century.' R. G. Marsden: 'The Early Career of Sir Martin Frobisher.' Reviews. F. Ll. Griffith: 'Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*.' D. G. Hogarth: 'G. F. Hill, *Historical Greek Coins*.' J. L. Myres: 'Waszynski, *Die Bodenpacht: agrargeschichtliche Papyrusstudien*.' A. Gardner: 'P. J. Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*.' E. W. Brooks: 'W. G. Holmes, *Age of Justinian and Theodore*.' Unfavourable. E. Kylie: 'Levison, *Vitae S. Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini*.' H. W. C. Davis: 'Schaub, *Der Kampf gegen den Zinswucher*.' C. R. Beazley: 'G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*.' Count Lützwow: 'Bachmann, *Geschichte Böhmens*.' J. Tait: 'Adams, *Political History of England, 1066-1216*.' J. B. Bury: 'Gerland, *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel*.' A. R. Malden: 'Sir E. M. Thompson, *Customary of the Benedictine Monasteries of St. Augustine, Canterbury and*

*St. Peter, Westminster.* J. P. Whitney: 'Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform.*' G. T. Warner: 'Paul, *History of Modern England*, III., IV.' 'E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History.*'

*The Economic Review* (Vol. XVI. No. 3. July 1906. Rivingtons). H. W. Blunt: 'The Community as Founder.' J. G. Leigh: 'The Ethics of Sacramentalism.' C. F. Yonge: 'Friendly Societies.' E. Powell: 'Alcoholism.' L. Phillips: 'The Clergy and Agriculture.' Reviews. F. B. Mason: 'L. T. Hobhouse, *The Labour Movement.*'

*Revue Biblique Internationale* (N.S. Vol. III. No. 3. July 1906. Paris: Lecoffre). L. de la V. Poussin: 'Le bouddhisme et les évangiles canoniques.' M. J. Lagrange: 'L'avènement du Fils de l'Homme.' Clermont-Ganneau: 'L'édit byzantin de Bersabée.' I. Guidi: 'Une description arabe du Sinaï.' MS. Vat. Arab. 286. A. Jaussen: 'Itinéraire de Nakhel à Pétra.' With map. Clermont-Ganneau: 'La marche de Saladin du Caire à Damas avec démonstration sur Kerak.' T. C.: 'G. B. Stevens, *Christian Doctrine of Salvation.*' M. J. Lagrange: 'Loisy, *Morceaux d'exégèse.*' A. Condamin: 'Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia.*' P. Batiffol: 'Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum.*' P. Dhorme: 'Nielsen, *Die altarabische Mondreligion und die mosaische Überlieferung.*'

*Revue Bénédictine* (Vol. XXIII. No. 3. July 1906. Abbaye de Maredsous). J. Chapman: 'Priscillian the Author of the Monarchian Prologues to the Vulgate Gospels.' G. Morin: 'Studia Caesariana. Nouvelle série d'inédits tirée du MS. 3 d'Épinal' (*suite et fin*). A. Clément: 'Conrad d'Urach, de l'ordre de Cîteaux, légat en France et en Allemagne' (*suite et fin*). M. Festugière: 'Quelle sera la philosophie de l'Eglise? L'Eglise—la philosophie traditionnelle' (*suite*). D. de Bruyne: 'Prétendus écrits d'Hippolyte.' C. Baur: 'S. Jérôme et S. Jean Chrysostome.' Comptes Rendus. B. Lebbe: 'Pesch, *De Inspiratione sacrae Scripturae*'; 'Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*'; 'J. Martin, *L'apologétique traditionnelle*'; 'Rampolla, *Santa Melania giuniore.*' D. de Bruyne: 'Harnack, *Luhas der Arzt*'; 'Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*'; 'Turmel, *Saint Jérôme.*' R. Proost: 'Brémond, *Newman: Essai de biographie psychologique*'; 'Krogh-Tønning, *Platon als Vorläufer des Christentums; Leibniz als Theolog.*' U. Berlière: 'A. d'Hoop, *Inventaire général des archives ecclésiastiques de Brabant, I.*'; 'De Bildt, *Christine de Suède et le Conclave de Clément X.*' G. Morin: 'Besson, *Recherches sur les origines des évêchés de Genève, Lausanne, Sion et leurs premiers titulaires jusqu'au déclin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle.*' Favourable. A. Clément: 'Lauer, *Les Annales de Flodoard.*'

*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Vol. VII. No. 3. July 1906. Louvain). J. Mahé: 'Les anathématismes de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie et les évêques orientaux du patriarchat d'Antioche.' P. Fournier: 'Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales: III. La Patrie des Fausses Décrétales; (a) Les provinces de Mayence et de Reims.' R. Maere: 'Les Origines de la Nonciature de Flandres. Étude sur la diplomatie pontificale dans les Pays-Bas à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.' L. Willater: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598-1625).' Comptes Rendus. A. Lemonnyer: 'C. van Crombrughe, *De soleriologia Christiana primis fontibus.*' J. Flamion: 'E. v. Dobschütz,

*Probleme des apostolischen Zeitalters,* and 'O. Pfeiderer, *Die Entstehung des Christenthums.*' É. Lecomte: 'Babut, *La plus ancienne Décretale.*' C. Baur: 'Loofs, *Nestoriana.*' P. de Puniet: 'Conybeare-Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum.*' J. Forget: 'Clugnet, *Vie de sainte Marine,*' and 'Kugener, *Sévère, patriarche d'Antioche, 512-518.*' M. Vaes: 'Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale en Gaule et Germanie, 742-882.*' C. Bellet: 'U. Chevalier, *Notre Dame de Lorette: étude historique sur l'authenticité de la Santa Casa.*' Very lengthy review. A. Brohée: 'Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz VIII.*' M. Legrand: 'Bullarium Franciscanum, V.-VII.' É. Tobac: 'Roth, *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte, II. (1531-7.)*' Dom J. Simon: 'De L. O'Leary, *The Apostolical Constitutions and Cognate Documents*'; 'J. Wickham Legg, *Ecclesiological Essays*'; 'H. Thurston, *The Stations of the Cross*'; 'Overton-Relton, *The English Church, 1714-1800.*'

*Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* (Vol. XI. No. 3. May-June 1906. Paris: Picard). J. Zeiller: 'Une légende hagiographique de Dalmatie: saint Domnius de Salone.' A. Dupin: 'Les origines des controverses trinitaires.' L. Saint-Paul: 'Notes d'épigraphie chrétienne — L'inscription *Magus puer.*' P. Lejay: 'Preuschen, *Palladius u. Rufinus,*' et 'Dom E. C. Butler, *Lausiaca History of Palladius*'; 'Rampolla, *S. Melania giuniore*'; 'A. Puech, *Recherches sur le "Discours aux Grecs" de Tatien*'; 'Gifford, *Eusebii evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV*'; 'Harnack, *Militia Christi*'; 'Knopf, *Ausgewählte Martyreracten*'; 'O. von Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta*, et 'Leclercq, *Les Martyrs: I, II, III*, Critical; 'Deismann, *Ein Original-Dokument aus der Diocletianischen Christenverfolgung, Papyrus 713 des British Museum*'; 'W. Meyer, *Die Legenden des h. Albanus, der Protomartyr Angliae, in Texten vor Beda*'; 'H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*'; 'Allard, *Julien l'Apostat.*' A. Dubois: 'H. Northcote, *Christianity and Sex Problems.*'

*Revue des Questions Historiques* (N.S. Vol. XXXVI. No. 159. July 1906. Paris: 5 rue Saint-Simon). E. Revillout: 'Amasis et la chute de l'empire Egyptien.' C. Daux: 'Un incident à la basilique d'Hippone en 411.' T. Richard: 'Origines de la Nonciature de France: Débuts de la représentation permanente sous Léon X, 1513-21.' A. Bonnefons: 'Le Culte de la Raison pendant la Terreur.' P. Allard: 'H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques.*' F. Cabrol: 'Jewish Encyclopædia, XI'; 'Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*'; 'The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers'; 'C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris antiquissima, II.*' (very favourable); 'Bury, *Life of St. Patrick.*' 'Conybeare-Maclean, *Rituale Armenorum.*' V. Ermoni: 'Turmel, *Histoire de la théologie positive, II.*' P. Allard: 'Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*, et 'Leclercq, *L'Afrique Chrétienne.*' S. Hellmann, *Sedulius Scottus.*'

*Studi Religiosi* (Vol. VI. No. 3. May-June 1906. Firenze). A. Palmieri: 'La mente e l'opera di Ermanno Schell.' E. Brémond: 'La filosofia religiosa di Newman.' M. Federici: 'Il Commercio e l'Industria degli antichi Ebrei.' L. Franceschi: 'Teologia morale e Scienza medica.' S. Minocchi: 'Versione di Isaia, cc. xxxviii. 10-xliii. 21.' Brémond, *Newman: Essai de Biographie psychologique.*' A. Houtin, *La question biblique au 19<sup>e</sup> siècle.*' 'Loisy, *Morceaux d'exégèse.*'

*Teologisk Tidsskrift* (Vol. VII. No. 4. 1906. Copenhagen). F. Torm: 'Om Johannesevangeliets Ægthed.' J. C. Jacobsen: 'Om Symboler og Symbolforpligtelse: En Replik' (see T. T. VII. 3). J. Jensen: 'Jacobsen-Koch, *Det Nye Testament*.' C. Glarbo: 'Grasz, *Die Gottheit Jesu Christi*,' and 'Lüttger, *Gottes Sohn in Gottes Geist*.' W. James, *Sjoelelere*, and 'Herrlin, *Sjoelelivets ubevidste Verden*.' E. Geismar: 'Krarup, *Religionsfilosofi*.' F. C. Krarup: 'O. T. Jacobsen, *Gennem Modsoetninger*.' E. Christensen: 'Opbyggelseslitteratur.'

*The East and the West* (Vol. IV. No. 15. July 1906. S. P. G.). F. L. Norris: 'The Opium Trade with China.' T. E. Slater: 'Transmigration.' D. Thornton: 'Eastern and Western Education in Cairo.' J. Macphail: 'Medical Missions in India.' J. L. Rees: 'The Three Religions of China and their Influence on Character.' A. E. Claxton: 'Some Chinese Characteristics.' E. H. Etheridge: 'The Education Question in Rhodesia.' J. P. Maud: 'The Supply and Training of Clergy.' Reviews: 'Vambéry, *Western Culture in Eastern Lands*.' 'J. Toshimichi Imai, *Bushido in the Past and in the Present*.' 'G. H. S. Walpole, *Personality and Power*.'

*Analecta Bollandiana* (Tom. XXV. Fasc. III. July 1906. Brussels). P. Peeters: 'Miraculum SS. Cyri et Johannis in urbe Monembasia.' MS. Paris Bibl. Nat., arabe 276. F. Cumont: 'Sarin dans le Testament des martyrs de Sébaste.' H. Moretus: 'Un opusculum du diacre Adelbert sur S. Martin de Montemassico.' MS. Bibl. Vallicellian. XXII. A. Poncelet: 'Vie et miracles du pape S. Léon IX.' E. Hocedez: 'La Légende latine du B. Venturino de Bergame.' F. van Ortrøy: 'Vie inédite de S. Bernardin de Sienne, par un Frère Mineur, son contemporain.' MS. Paris Bibl. Nat. Nouv. acq. lat. 758. Bulletin. P. P[eters]: 'Delehay, *Les versions grecques des Actes des martyrs persans sous Sapor II*.' 'Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche, IV<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> siècle*.' Important. A. P[oncelet]: 'Whitley Stokes, *The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*.' 'Besson, *Recherches sur les origines des évêques de Genève, Lausanne, Sion*.' Favourable. H. D[elehay]: 'Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*.' 'Healy, *The Valerian Persecution*.' 'P. Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*. IV, *d'Arno à Victorin*.' 'Holzey, *Die Thekla-Akten*.' 'G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*,' and 'J. Turmal, *S. Jérôme*.' 'G. Schlumberger, *L'épople byzantine*. III, 1025-1057.' H. Moretus: 'F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*.' [F.] V[an] O[rtroy]: 'Thode, *Franz von Assisi*.' 'Rosedale, *St. Francis of Assisi according to Brother Thomas of Celano*.' 'E. d'Alençon, *S. Francisci Assisiensis Vita et Miracula*.'

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed in Short Notices or Articles as space permits.

#### BIBLICAL STUDIES.

BRIGGS, C. A. and E. G.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 'International Critical Commentary.' In Two (Volumes. Vol. 1. Pp. cx + 422. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 10s. 6d.

DU BUISSON, J. C.—*The Gospel according to St. Mark explained*. 'The Churchman's Bible.' Pp. xxx + 220. (Methuen.) 2s. 6d. net.

GREENWOOD, G.—*The Book of Genesis treated as an Authentic Record.* Part III. From the Death of Noah to the Call of Abram. Pp. 188. (The Church Printing Co.)

KENT, C. F.—*The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament.* Pp. xii + 270. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

REDPATH, H. A.—*Hatch and Redpath's Concordance to the Septuagint.* Supplement. Fasc. II. Containing a Concordance to Ecclesiasticus, other Addenda, and Hebrew Index to the whole work. Pp. 165-272. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.) 16s.

STREATFIELD, G. S.—*The Self-Interpretation of Jesus Christ: a Study of the Messianic Consciousness as reflected in the Synoptics.* Pp. xvi + 212. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

SWETE, H. B.—*The Apocalypse of St. John.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices. Pp. ccxvi + 336. (Macmillan.) 15s.

WESTCOTT, RIGHT REV. B. F. (the late).—*St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.* The Greek Text, with Notes and Addenda. Pp. lxxviii + 212. (Macmillan.) 10s. 6d.

*The Interlinear Bible.* The Authorised Version and the Revised Version together with the marginal notes of both Versions and central references. Pp. xx + 352. (Cambridge: at the University Press.) 12s. 6d. net.

#### APOLOGETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

LADD, G. T.—*The Philosophy of Religion: a Critical and Speculative Treatise of Man's Religious Experience and Development in the Light of Modern Science and Reflective Thinking.* 2 vols. Pp. xx + 616, xii + 590. (Longmans.) 28s. net.

SPARROW-SIMPSON, W. J.—*The Christian Doctrine of God.* Lectures delivered to the members of the St. Paul's Lecture Society. Pp. viii + 154. (For the Society. R. Flint and Co.) 1s. 6d. net.

WOODS, F. H.—*For Faith and Science.* Pp. xiv + 208. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

*Topics for the Times.* By various authors. Pp. 232. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. 6d. Christian Evidence Lectures.

#### CHURCH HISTORY.

BIGG, C.—*Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History.* Nine Lectures, with Notes and Preface. Pp. xii + 230. (Longmans.) 7s. 6d. net.

LAWLOR, H. T.—*The Reformation and the Irish Episcopate.* 'Church Historical Society,' Tract xciii. Pp. 60. (S.P.C.K.) 4d.

MARIN, A.—*Saint Théodore (759-826.)* Collection 'Les Saints.' Pp. iv + 200. (Paris: V. Lecoffre.) 2 fr. See 'Short Notices.'

NIELSEN, F. (Bishop of Aarhus).—*History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century.* Edited by A. J. MASON. 2 vols. Pp. xvi + 378, vi + 482. (Murray.) 24s. net.

WORKMAN, H. B.—*Persecution in the Early Church: a Chapter in the History of Renunciation.* 'Fernley Lecture.' Pp. xx + 382. (C. H. Kelly.) 3s. 6d.

#### DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

ABBOTT, E. A.—*Silvanus the Christian.* Pp. 368. (A & C. Black.) 7s. 6d. net.

BONJOANNES, BERARDUS (A.D. 1560).—*Compendium of the Summa*

*Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas, Pars Prima.* Translated into English. Revised by W. FLESCHER. With Introduction and an Appendix explanatory of Scholastic Terms by C. FALCINI. Pp. xxiv+310. (London: T. Baker.) 6s. 6d. net.

D'ALÈS, A.—*La Théologie de saint Hippolyte.* Pp. liv+242. (Paris: G. Beauchesne et Cie.) 6 fr. net.

FEL, R. M.—*De Evangeliorum Inspiratione. De Dogmatis Evolutione. De Arcani Disciplina.* Pp. viii+114. (Paris: G. Beauchesne et Cie.) 2 fr. 50.

#### CONTROVERSIAL THEOLOGY.

BENSON, R. H.—*The Religion of the Plain Man.* Pp. xii+164. (Burns and Oates.) 2s. 6d. net.

HASE, K. VON.—*Handbook to the Controversy with Rome.* Translated from the Seventh Edition of the *Handbuch des Protestantischen Polemik gegen die Römisch-katholische Kirche* and edited, with Notes, by A. W. STREANE. Two Volumes. Pp. lxii+416, vi+564. (Religious Tract Society.) 21s.

HORNOLD, V. (S.J.)—*The Religion of Our Forefathers.* Parts I.-VII. Pp. x+204. (Burns and Oates.) 1s. 3d. Part VIII. *The Church in England, Past and Present.* Pp. 40. Part IX. *Catholic Orders and Anglican Orders.* Pp. 32. (Burns and Oates.) 2d. each.

MATTHEW, A. H. (Edited by).—*Ecclesia: the Church of Christ.* A Planned Series of Papers (by various Roman Catholic writers). Pp. xviii+182. (Burns and Oates.) 3s. 6d. net.

#### SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

*Sermons for the People, Second Series. Plain Sermons for the Christian Year.* By various contributors. Vol. VI. Ninth Sunday after Trinity until Festival of St. Michael and All Angels (inclusive). Vol. VII. Seventeenth Sunday until Twenty-Fifth Sunday after Trinity. Pp. iv+194, iv+200. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. each. Two more volumes of a very interesting series by well known preachers.

'An Oxford M.A.'—*The Little Sermon Book.* Sixty-four short sermons for the Sundays and chief Holy Days of the Christian Year, with Blank Leaves for MS. additions. Pp. vi+192. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

HUNT, W. H. (edited by).—*Churchmanship and Labour.* Sermons on Social Subjects preached at St. Stephen's, Walbrook, by Canon SCOTT HOLLAND and others. Pp. x+272. (Skeffingtons.) 5s.

MORTIMER, A. G.—*One Hundred Miniature Sermons.* Being a very full Outline Sermon on the Epistles and Gospels for all the Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days of the Christian Year. Part I. Advent to Ash Wednesday. Pp. 160. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

PAGET, F. E. (the late).—*Helps and Hindrances to the Christian Life: Plain Village Sermons.* Part I. Advent to Whitsunday. 'Sermon Library,' Vol. V. Pp. xvi+230. (Skeffingtons.) 2s. net.

RIDGEWAY, VERY REV. C. J. (Dean of Carlisle).—*The King and His Kingdom, and other Sermons: Last Words in a West End Church.* Pp. xii+196. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d. net.

WHELPTON, V.—*Simple Bible Teaching on the Rudiments of Christianity.* Being expository addresses on Hebrews vi. 1-2. Pp. 46. (Mowbrays.) 6d.



## DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BAINVEL, J. V.—*La Dévotion au Sacré Cœur de Jésus. Doctrine—Histoire.* Pp. viii+374. (Paris: G. Beauchesne et Cie.) 3 fr. 50.

GORDON, S. D.—*Quiet Talks about Jesus.* Pp. 288. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 2s. 6d. net.

MONTAGU, HENRY (EARL OF MANCHESTER).—*Death and Immortality.* 'Library of Devotion.' With an Introduction by E. WATERHOUSE. Pp. xxxviii+192. (Methuen.) 2s. A charming little edition of the seventeenth-century *Contemplatio Mortis et Immortalitatis*.

SNAGGE, M. F. (Lady).—*Simple Talks to Little Children on Holy Subjects.* With Preface by CANON MACCOLL. Pp. 248. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d.

*The Soul's Escape.* By the Author of *The Sanctus Bell.* With Preface by J. BRETT. Pp. xxiv+180. (Skeffingtons.) 3s. 6d.

THORNTON, J.—*From the Porch to the Altar: a Catechism on the Church, illustrated from Holy Scripture.* For the use of Senior Children or Communicants' Guilds. Pp. 38. (Elliot Stock.) 2s. 6d. net. The various portions of a Church symbolically interpreted.

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

A KEMPIS, THOMAS.—*The Chronicles of the Canons Regular of Mount St. Agnes.* Translated by J. P. ARTHUR. Pp. xvi+236. (Kegan Paul.) 5s. net. See Article.

BAKER, A.—*The Besetting Sin: a Word to the Newly Confirmed.* Pp. 54. (S.P.C.K.)

TAYLOR, J. W.—*The Coming of the Saints: Imaginations and Studies in Early Church History and Tradition.* With twenty-six illustrations. Pp. xvi+326. (Methuen.) 7s. 6d. net.

WILSON, J. M.—*Notes for One Year's Sunday School Lessons.* Series V. Pp. 126. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

## MISSIONS.

DENNIS, J. S.—*Christian Missions and Social Progress: a Sociological Study of Foreign Missions.* Vol. III. Pp. xxxviii+676. (Oliphant, Anderson, and Ferrier.) 10s. net.

MONTGOMERY, H. B.—*Christus Redemptor: an Outline Study of the Island World of the Pacific.* Pp. viii+282. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

## LITURGICA.

CORNFORD, J. (the late).—*The Book of Common Prayer, with Historical Notes.* Pp. xxx+338. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 4d. A very cheap Reprint.

'An Oxford Layman.'—*Faith and Freedom.* A few considerations on the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Pp. 46. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

## HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

ACTON, LORD (the late).—*Lectures on Modern History.* Edited, with an Introduction, by J. N. FIGGIS and R. V. LAURENCE. Pp. xx+362. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

JONES, E. A.—*The Church Plate of the Diocese of Bangor.* Pp. xxxvi+160. (Bemrose.) 21s. net. With 36 magnificent illustrations.

OMAN, C.—*The Great Revolt of 1381*. With two maps. Pp. viii + 220. (Oxford : at the Clarendon Press.) 8s. 6d. net.

RAVEN, J. J.—*The Bells of England*. 'The Antiquary's Books.' With sixty illustrations. Pp. xvi + 338. (Methuen.) 7s. 6d. net.

VAUGHAN, H. M.—*The Last of the Royal Stuarts : Henry Stuart Cardinal Duke of York*. Pp. xx + 310. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d. net.

#### BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

AUSTEN LEIGH, W.—*Augustus Austen Leigh, Provost of King's College, Cambridge : a Record of College Reform*. With Portraits. Pp. xii + 306. (Smith, Elder.) 8s. 6d. net.

CAREY, R. NOUCHETTE.—'No Friend like a Sister.' Pp. viii + 442. (Macmillan.) 6s.

GASQUET, ABBOT (Edited by).—*Lord Acton and his Circle*. Pp. lxxxviii + 372. (G. Allen and Burns and Oates.) 15s. net. One hundred and seventy-eight letters.

TUCKER, T. G.—*The Frogs of Aristophanes*. Edited, with Introduction, Commentary and Critical Notes. Pp. lx + 276. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net.

WAY, A. S.—*Æschylus in English Verse*. Part I. *The Seven against Thebes. The Persians*. Pp. 100. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net.

WELLS, H. G.—*In the Days of the Comet*. Pp. viii + 306. (Macmillan.) 6s.

WOLLASTON, A. N.—*Sadi's Scroll of Wisdom*. With Introduction. 'Wisdom of the East' Series. Pp. 64. (Murray.) 1s. net.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

MASSINGBERD, A.—*Simple Continental Dishes*. Pp. 66. (Wells Gardner.) 4d. Recipes.

'RIPARIUS.'—*The Ways of the Week-Enders*. Pp. 24. (Elliot Stock.) 4d.

*The Hundred and Second Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, with Appendix and List of Subscribers and Benefactors, MDCCCXVI*. Pp. xvi + 470 + ii + 272. (Bible House, 146 Queen Victoria Street, E.C.) 1s.

*Bible Stories in Coloured Pictures*. Pp. 50. (S.P.C.K.)

*There is a River : a Popular Illustrated Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1905-1906*. Pp. viii + 112. (For the Society.)

ALSTON, L.—*Stoic and Christian in the Second Century : a Comparison of the Ethical Teaching of Marcus Aurelius with that of Contemporary and Antecedent Christianity*. 'Burney Prize.' Pp. x + 148. (Longmans.) 3s. net.

FRAZER, J. G.—*Adonis, Attis, Osiris : Studies in the History of Oriental Religion*. Pp. xvi + 340. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

HALL, SIR S.—*A Short History of the Oxford Movement*. Pp. x + 268. (Longmans.) 4s. 6d. net.

KING, SIR C. S., BART.—*A Great Archbishop of Dublin, William King, D.D., 1650-1729 : his Autobiography, Family, and a Selection from his Correspondence*. Pp. xiv + 332. (Longmans.) 10s. 6d.